E ETHICS OF PAUL

RTON SCOTT ENSLIN

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUL 2 1930
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Division BS2655
Section .E8E5

ETON
10
INARY

THE
ETHICS
OF PAUL

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUL 2 1930
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE
ETHICS OF PAUL

by

MORTON SCOTT ENSLIN

Th.D. (Harvard)

PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND
EXEGESIS, THE CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

1930
NEW YORK AND LONDON
HARPER & BROTHERS PUBLISHERS

THE ETHICS OF PAUL

◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆

Copyright, 1930, by
Harper and Brothers
Printed in the U. S. A.

◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆◆

FIRST EDITION
C–E

R. T. E.

εὔηθες ἴσως μακρηγορεῖν
ἐστι περὶ τῶν οὕτως ἐμφανῶν

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction xi

PART I

Forces that Contributed to the Moral Teachings of Paul

Chapter I 1
Paul's Heritage from Judaism
Chapter II 17
The Contribution of the Stoa
Chapter III 45
The Oriental Mystery Cults and Ethics

PART II

The Ethics of Paul

SECTION I—ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

Chapter IV 63
The Central Place of Morality in the Life and Thought of Paul

THE STANDARDS—CRITERIA OF CONDUCT

Chapter V 81
The Answer of Judaism
Chapter VI 90
The Answer of Stoicism
Chapter VII 107
The Ultimate Answer of Paul

SECTION II—MORAL PRECEPTS

Chapter VIII 133
Separate Yourselves from All That Would Defile
Chapter IX 197
Be Steadfast in All the Conduct of Life
Chapter X 231
Through Love Serve One Another
Chapter XI 295
Rejoice in the Lord Always: Again I Will Say, Rejoice
Conclusion 308
Index 311

It is surprising to discover how little attention has been paid to the ethical teachings of the apostle Paul in the thousands of volumes that have been written on different phases of his life and thought. Matthew Arnold remarked, not entirely without cause, that the controversy on justification by faith had flooded the world with an ocean of verbiage. The γάρ's and the δέ's have been painstakingly studied in the effort to determine their significance for Paul's theological dictums. Nor has this been without profit. Paul's thought amply repays all study, and each rereading makes discoveries hitherto unnoted. This makes the almost entire absence of work on the ethical teachings the more amazing. Perhaps it may not be too rash to hazard the guess that one reason scholars have not devoted more energy to this phase of New Testament study is that they have felt it would be too simple; that all one would need do would be to gather together the groups of disjointed precepts at the ends of the various epistles. And so they have turned from this very fruitful field to wrestle with Paul's arguments, of which the conclusions are as lucid as the reasons are obscure.

To relegate Paul's ethical teaching to the background of his thought is to misunderstand the apostle completely. Percy Gardner has aptly remarked:

> In that Epistle (*i.e.* Romans) he is mainly bent, as in the Corinthian Epistles he is almost entirely bent, upon what is ethical, what has relation to conduct, and to human love and hope. He drifts into a doctrinal discussion, I had almost said a doctrinal slough, because it lies directly in his path. But he is not happy there, nor do I think that he there shows at his best. And it is with obvious relief that he goes back to his ethical exhortation.[1]

The debt Christianity owes to Paul is threefold, and in each part it is concerned with human conduct. To the Jew, Paul insisted upon freedom from the law. In protest against the laxity in morals in the Hellenistic world he stressed the sturdy Jewish morality with its insistence on the purity of family life. Nor were these two all. In addition to them he struck the note of *κοινωνία*, fellowship, not alone with the Lord—the Oriental cults taught that—but with the fellow believers. The Greek speculative systems were woefully weak here, with little or no attempt to organize their followers into local groups or to stimulate them to life. In this field Paul was a pioneer. Jesus had had no thought of founding a church. His aim had been the purification of the national spirit; his challenge, "Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."

Paul formed an organic entity bound by the closest of ties to a living source whose members would mutually stimulate one another to the utmost. His plan worked. Certain excrescences have been sloughed off, but his principle was sound and his work has lasted. Today there is much talk of "going back to Jesus." In all reverence it may be said that had it not been for Paul or some one like him at that critical day there is good reason to believe there never would have been any Christianity. Regardless of the intrinsic worth of teachings, unless people know them they can exert little influence.

---

[1] *The Religious Experience of St. Paul*, p. 139.

In many ways the canons of ethics will be seen to be broken in the form in which Paul's teaching is discussed in the following pages. It may be objected, for example, that religion and ethics are not differentiated with sufficient clearness. My only apology is that I question whether Paul would have understood the criticism. For him morals and religion were indissolubly united, if not actually identical, though it was his lifelong task to get his churches to realize it.

Convinced of the hopeless nature of the attempt to understand a man apart from his age, I have devoted a considerable space to a consideration of the teachings of Judaism and of Stoicism, as well as the Oriental mysteries, in the endeavor to determine to what extent Paul's thought was molded by his heritage and environment and to what extent it was different. What one wants is to see not only what the ethics of Paul was, but what else it *might have been* if it had been different! No effort has been made to prepare exhaustive lexicographical studies of all the terms used by Paul for virtues and vices. This has been done by W. C. Morro *Paul's Terms for Vices and Virtues* (Harv. Univ. Dissertation, 1906), while Trench's *Synonyms*, with occasional word studies in the various commentaries (particularly Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* *on the Epistle to the Galatians*, pp. 304–318), provides a wealth of material. In the discussion of the various vices and virtues attention has been directed to the principles underlying Paul's classification of them as vices or as virtues rather than to the discussion of the various shades of meaning in the terms themselves—often loosely used. In other words, while in many cases a detailed exegesis of a passage has seemed necessary, the attempt has been made to avoid reproducing the work of the commentator needlessly.

As sources for Paul's teachings all the "Pauline" epistles except the Pastorals have been used. Aside from occasional footnotes they have been disregarded. As has been pointed out in the following pages, they reflect the halfway stage between the informal attempts at detailed directions for Christian conduct to be found in the Haustafeln of Ephesians and Colossians and the detailed prescriptions in the *Pedagogue* of Clement of Alexandria.

Regarding Ephesians and Colossians the matter is different. Approaching them with suspicion, the close work necessitated by such a study has tended to convince me of their substantial genuineness—Colossians surely, Ephesians in all probability. While an advance in the matter of Christology is to be seen—though hardly beyond what might be expected in a versatile mind such as Paul's—they seem to be in fundamental harmony with the epistles against which no serious question can be raised. The agreements, however, are of a nature to be more convincing to the commentator, forced to a close study of the thought, than to the writer of an introduction. For example, the figure representing Christians as members of the body whose head was Christ, while not expressly stated in II Corinthians, exactly caps the teaching there. Yet for another to have sensed how perfectly and subtly this would complete Paul's thought would demand an understanding of his model far in advance, to say the least, of that displayed by the ordinary falsarius.

However that may be, these two epistles have been used without discrimination—except as evidencing a later development of thought—as genuinely Pauline. For those who feel that the preponderance of the evidence is against their genuineness the value of this work will be proportionately diminished. In fact, I feel far less confidence in the authenticity of II Thessalonians than of either Colossians or Ephesians. I have refrained, however, possibly unwisely, from excluding it from the *Corpus Paulinarum*. Whatever conclusions one reaches regarding that letter, he will, I fancy, be convinced that the framework is at any rate Pauline—if only a slavish copy—and so preserving ethical teaching in complete agreement with that of the letters about which no reasonable doubt can be raised.

I have endeavored to acknowledge my indebtedness so completely in the succeeding pages that a special bibliography seems unnecessary. In English there are but two books especially devoted to the subject of the ethics of Paul, though an occasional chapter is to be found, as in the excellent little book by Percy Gardner, *The Religious Experiences of St. Paul* (1911), and in Cone, *Paul—The Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher* (1898). The two exclusively concerned with this subject are A. B. D. Alexander, *The Ethics of St. Paul* (1910), and W. Martin, *St. Paul's Ethical Teaching* (1917). Especially is it true of the latter that it is hardly more than a restatement of what Paul himself says—and I must be pardoned for saying that Paul said it rather better—with an occasional sporadic note. Alexander's work, though rather too homiletical and too minutely articulated, is better. Its principal flaw is an almost complete reticence on the burning problem for Paul—sexual purity. It also suffers, as do almost all the works, from an inadequate treatment of the contemporary systems.

English lang.
has 2 main
works on
Pauline ethics

In German for a long time Ernesti's work, *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus* (1st ed., 1868; 3rd, 1880), held the field alone. Its chief defect is that all is heaped together without discrimination or comparative evaluation. In the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* (1892), pp. 109–146, von Soden had an article, "Die Ethik des Paulus." Juncker's two-volume work, *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus* (I, 1904; II, 1919), is most comprehensive and satisfactory and has apparently been used quite extensively by J. Weiss in his chapter "Die paulinische Ethik" in the second part (published posthumously, 1917) of his *Das Urchristentum.* This last in a measure seeks to meet the need of a comparison of Paul with his contemporaries. The article by R. Bultmann, "Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," in the *ZNTW*, 1924 (vol. xxvii, 1 and 2), should also be mentioned. J. Weiss's commentary on I Corinthians is indispensable. Brief chapters in Feine, Holtzmann, and Weinel's treatises on New Testament Theology are good, but suffer from the obvious defect of being side issues and hence containing little beside the obvious. The various works comparing Jesus and Paul are on the whole more satisfactory. Feine, *Jesus Christus und Paulus* (1902) (esp. pp. 185–209, "Die Stellung zu den Gutern dieser Welt"), is excellent. Mention may also be made of Jülicher, *Paulus und Jesus* (1907), and J. Weiss, *Paulus und Jesus* (1909) (esp. pp. 60–72; answered by Kurt Deissner, *Paulus und Seneca* (1917), and A. Deissmann, *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul* (1923).

Numerous books on the relation of the Stoics to Christianity have been cited in the following pages. Among others of this type may be mentioned: Fleury, *Saint Paul et Sénèque* (2 vols., 1853); Aubertin, *Sénèque et Saint Paul* (1869); Westerburg, *Der Ursprung der Sage, dass Seneca Christ gewesen sei* (1881); Kreyer, *Seneca und seine Beziehung zum Urchristentum* (1887); Bonhöffer, *Die Ethik des Stoikers Epictet* (1894); Bonhöffer, *Epictet und das Neue Testament* (1911); Toussaint, *L'hellénisme et l'apôtre Paul* (1921); Schmitz, *Der Freiheitsgedanke bei Epiktet und das Freiheitszeugnis des Paulus* (1923). To mention Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, Constant Martha, *Les moralistes sous l'empire Romain*, Dill, *Roman Society*, or Lecky, *History* *of European Morals,* would be akin to referring to Webster's Dictionary.

It is impossible adequately to express my indebtedness to George Foot Moore's monumental work, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era—The Age of the Tannaim* (2 vols., 1927). Whatever may be found to be of value in the following discussion of the nature of Jewish thought must be largely attributed to what I have learned not only from this last work, but also from word of mouth in seminar and conversation with this prince of scholars.

I have tried to be punctilious in acknowledging specific indebtedness in footnotes, but while I would be loath to believe that I have consciously borrowed without acknowledgment, yet from the nature of the task many books that have been indispensable cannot be specially noticed. Above all I would express my gratitude to my former teachers and valued friends, James Hardy Ropes, George Foot Moore, and Kirsopp Lake, of the Theological Faculty at Harvard, who have been ever ready to give of their abundant knowledge.

The citations of Seneca are from the last editions in the Teubner texts; those of Epictetus from Schenkl's edition in the same series. In all other cases it is hoped that the footnotes will provide ample information.

The author is indebted to the International Council of Religious Education for permission to quote from the text of the American Revised Version of the Bible, copyrighted 1929 by the International Council of Religious Education.

Regularly the classic authors have been quoted in translation. While many of the translations are my own, I have not hesitated to make use of the many and admirable renderings which have been made available by the industry of many scholars to whom I would make this grateful, if general, acknowledgment.

PART I

Forces that Contributed to the Moral Teachings of Paul

◆◆◆

Chapter I—Paul's Heritage from Judaism

UPON reading such a passage as Philippians 3:4–12, where Paul seems unequivocally to break with Judaism and to reckon as loss and even refuse all that he had previously considered of the greatest value, there is a tendency to conclude that Paul sloughed off Judaism when he became a Christian; that at his conversion his eyes were opened to the inadequacy—not to say innate hostility—of the old system; and that accordingly we can with perfect safety neglect his Jewish heritage as a factor in considering his more mature life and thought. This error in judgment produces an entire misconception of the true nature of Judaism and tends to make Paul originate or draw from alien sources many elements which may be adequately explained from his Jewish heritage.

The clue to be kept in mind in trying to appreciate Jewish ethics is that for a Jew morals and religion were one: "Ethics is the soul of Jewish religion." God was the center of the Jew's life and thought. God had revealed a religion given through the fathers and Moses to Israel, which was eventually to become the universal religion. He had revealed his whole will; everything that men were to do he had been pleased to reveal to them. Moral conduct, the way in which worship was to be conducted, how man should feel toward him, even man's attitude of mind and will—all these things God had revealed. This was God's great gift to man. The Jew called it *Torah.*

The result was that the Jew strove with all his might to learn God's will—which was his for the learning—and to do it. Law-keeping became synonymous with morality and religion. And he sought to keep the law with no ulterior motive. He did it because he loved God and desired to do his will. Had he been asked why he did it, he might have answered that the fulfillment of God's long-deferred promises of a golden age was dependent upon the conformity of his people as a whole to his will as he had revealed it and as they knew it. But that would have been to a large extent an explanation, not a reason. The Jew did what was right because it was right and he desired to do it. His whole nature urged it. God's will had become his will.

TIVE BEHIND
WISH ETHICS

To think that he kept the Torah in order to save his soul, to avoid divine retribution in this life, and to enjoy a place in the world to come, is to approach the matter from the wrong end. The individual Israelite had no particular anxiety regarding the future, for all Israelites would eventually have a place in the world to come. The three or four cases in the Talmudic literature of godly rabbis being apprehensive at the approach of death are not representative of Judaism. They are conspicuous by their fewness and occur only in the cases of the ultra-pious, who are always most alarmed at their shortcomings. And so we can practically neglect the hope of eternal salvation as a motive for a normal Jew of this period toward keeping the Torah. The true motive was quite the reverse, namely, loyalty to the religion which God had graciously revealed; for this religion was the supreme blessing in life.

Accordingly, keeping of Torah was no hardship. We are wont to be over-influenced by Jesus' condemnation of certain Pharisees who laid emphasis on the letter rather than the spirit, and by the seventh chapter of Romans. It is extremely doubtful if any Jew, left to himself, felt that way. Historians like Schürer with apologetic purposes have tended to strengthen this misconception, both because of an unconscious belief in the superiority of Christianity to Judaism, and also—I fear—because of unimaginative honesty. With an entirely different heritage and surroundings the keeping of Torah would have been to them indescribably dull; hence they conclude it must have been for the Jews. It is not too much to say that in all probability there were many Jews at the dawn of our era who could have said with perfect truthfulness, "Oh, how I love thy law!"[1] or again, of the righteous man, "His delight is in the law of the Lord, and on his law doth he meditate day and night."[2] "The law of thy mouth is better unto me than thousands of gold and silver."[3] "My soul breaketh for the longing that it hath unto thine ordinances at all times."[4] "And I shall walk at liberty; for I have sought thy precepts,"[5] a sentiment echoed by R. Nechonyiah

[1] Psalm 119:97.

[2] Psalm 1:2; cf. Psalm 19:7–11; 40:8.

[3] Psalm 119:72.

[4] Psalm 119:20; cf. also Psalm 139:17.

[5] Psalm 119:45.

b. ha-Kanah[6] (*ca.* 80 A.D.): "Whoso receiveth upon him the yoke of Torah, they remove from him the yoke of royalty and the yoke of worldly care," and again R. Jehoshua b. Levi[7] (*ca.* 240 A.D.): "Thou wilt find no freeman but him who is occupied in learning of Torah." "The son who serves his father serves him with joy, saying, 'Even if I do not entirely succeed (in carrying out his commandments), yet, as a loving father, he will not be angry with me; while the Gentile slave is always afraid lest he may commit some fault, and therefore serves God in a condition of anxiety and confusion.'"[8]

No true Jew ever expected to obtain salvation[9] by perfect law observance. He knew that was impossible. But he strove as nearly as possible to accomplish God's will. Repentance and turning back to God with resultant forgiveness was essential.[10] And here we need observe an instance of the high moral standard of Jewish ethics. Retribution must be made before God would forgive. When Jesus[11] demands that reconciliation precede the seeking of God's good will, he is speaking as a Jew. It has seemed wise, even at the extent of some space, to emphasize this matter, which is often obscured.

[6] Abot 3, 6.

[7] *Ibid.* 6, 2.

[8] Tanhuma Noah, 19.

[9] Indeed, the use of the term *salvation* in a discussion of Jewish hopes and aspirations is unfortunate. The conception of salvation is distinctly Greek, not Jewish. The Greek jailer at Philippi may ask Paul and Silas, "Sirs, what must I do *to be saved?*" (Acts 16:30), but the rich young Jew asks, "What shall I do *that I may inherit eternal life?*" (Mark 10:17). It is a pity that scholars who of course themselves know better continue the use of a term that is bound to confuse.

[10] Isa. 1:16–20.

[11] Matt. 5:24.

Much that is said in criticism of Judaism may be true, but the artificial explanations of the Jew's strict keeping of Torah are false, and arise in no small measure from reading our conception of law, namely, a product of legislators' ingenuity—often unjust—back into the term Torah; a view which would have scandalized any Jew, to whom Torah was religion, the perfect and just expression of God's holy will. In seeking to understand any system of ethics (systemized or not) an appreciation of the underlying motives is essential. The distinctive motive for the Jew in moral conduct has always been "kiddush ha-Shem."

Torah had been revealed by God, as we have seen, but also Torah revealed God, and the true Jew sought as the *summum bonum* of life to be as near like God as possible: "My good men, the best of all prayers, and the end, and proper object of happiness, is to attain to a likeness of God."[12] And, since every man was created in the image of God, this was possible and obligatory. "Ye shall be holy; for I Jehovah your God am holy"[13] was of primary importance to the Jew, and stood at the center of Jewish ethics. Whatever the initial meaning of קדש had been, it had come to possess a moral content very different from the Greek ἅγιος. God demanded a high morality from Israel as being in keeping with his own nature. It is to be observed here that even from the most primitive times we have absolutely no hint of a scandalous story regarding Jehovah.[14] The intrigues and immoralities of the Greek and Roman and Babylonian pantheons are entirely absent here. The importance of this point cannot be too strongly emphasized. The Jewish abhorrence of sexual impurity had from the beginning the sanction of their God.

---

[12] Philo, *de Decalogo* xv (§73) 193M.

[13] Lev. 19:2; cf. Lev. 20:7; 21:8.

The confidence that Israel was Jehovah's peculiar people colored the whole of Hebrew life and effectually prevented a separation of morality and religion. Sin for the Jew was not a case of "missing the mark" nor an error of judgment, but rebellion against God. This self-consciousness tended greatly to emphasize the social virtues. The Jews were ever conscious of their separateness. A more universal note might come, as in the later prophets, and the wisdom literature; nevertheless, it never obscured the line of demarcation. Israel was different; the Hebrew bore in his body the distinguishing mark. The result was unity and strength. Since as a people he stood apart from the rest of the world, he must of necessity be more closely joined to his fellows. A great emphasis was put on keeping the individual fit. One of Hillel's famous "three words"[15] was "If I am not for myself, who will be for me?" but the second was, "And being for my own self, what am I?" Self-preservation, improvement, perfection were duties of every man; the body was the temple of God in which the divine spirit was enshrined. Neglect of it was sinful.

---

[14] The conventional spelling of the name will be used in these pages, since it has seemed pedantic to print the tetragrammaton and since the present writer has no desire to perpetrate a fresh guess as to the original pronunciation.

[15] Abot 1, 14.

> See what care is bestowed upon the statue of the emperor to keep it clean and bright; ought we not likewise keep God's image, our body, clean and free from every blemish?[16]

Only by first ennobling self could one contribute to the elevation of the world about him. Thus the individual by making himself better helped the whole.

As I have suggested, the ideal for the Jew was to make himself as nearly like God as possible. He was to walk in all his (God's) ways.[17] He was to be kind to the stranger, the widow, and the orphan, and was to relieve their necessity, for God loved them and granted them food and clothing.[18] There was one law for both native and stranger.[19] Thus an emphasis was laid on the social virtues. As early, at any rate, as Hillel, the golden rule in its negative form was known; for Hillel, telling the proselyte what he should do, said: "Do not do to your fellow what you hate to have done to you. This is the whole law, entire; the rest is explanation. Go, learn."[20]

HIGH MORAL
OF JUDAIS

Honesty and truthfulness were enjoined; falsehood, deceit, and the shedding of blood were abhorrent. Slavery was recognized and accepted, but even here kindness was enjoined, and, though actually the release prescribed for the seventh year was probably never fulfilled, it at least stood as a protest and appeal.

---

[16] Hillel in Lev. R. 34, 3; cf. Epict. 2, 8, 10–14 (see p. 28); 4, 11, 1–36; I Cor. 3:16 f.; 6:19 f.

[17] Deut. 11:22; cf. Paul's constant use of the phrase περιπατεῖν κτλ.

[18] Deut. 10:18 f.

[19] Lev. 19:18, 33 f.; Exod. 12:49. But see also pp. 279 f.

[20] Shabbat 31a. Cf. Wettstein, *Nov. Test. Græcum* on Matt. 7:12 for parallels in the Greek and Roman writers.

And then God was preëminently a God of justice. "The first question a man is asked at the Last Judgment is whether he has dealt justly with his neighbor."[21] God is not one who shows favoritism or partiality and never accepts a bribe; neither must his people.[22] And in the passage from the Old Testament which describes the ideal man, the flower of human achievement, emphasis is laid on just these virtues:

> He that walketh righteously, and speaketh uprightly; he that despiseth the gain of oppressions, that shaketh his hands from taking a bribe, that stoppeth his ears from hearing of blood, and shutteth his eyes from looking upon evil: he shall dwell on high;[23]

while truth, justice, mercy, freedom from slander, and purity of heart are the praiseworthy virtues of Psalm 15 and Psalm 24:1–6.

Another characteristic of Jewish life was the emphasis laid on family life. Marriage was ordained by God, who had bade them be fruitful and multiply. A sane home life was the normal thing; celibacy abnormal. The average Jewish boy married by his eighteenth year, while there are records of marriage at the age of twelve. Marriage was elevated to a holy plane by the use of this figure to illustrate Jehovah's bond with Israel, a figure which Paul employs to symbolize the union of Christ and the church. Parents were to be held in greatest reverence. Sexual purity was a fundamental requirement. Adultery was forbidden in the decalogue, while incest and other sexual perversions were directly forbidden by Lev. 18.[24]

---

[21] Shabbat 31a.

[22] Lev. 19:15; Deut. 1:17; 16:19; Prov. 24:23; Mal. 2:9.

[23] Isa. 33:15 f.

As a conclusion to this brief picture of Jewish ethics at the beginning of the Christian era a quotation from a modern Jewish writer may not be out of place:

> As a holy nation Israel's public and private life was under consecration; justice, truthfulness, solicitude for the weak, obedience and reverence for those in authority, regard for the rights of others, strong and weak, a forgiving and candid spirit, love for fellow man, and mercy for the beast, and chastity appear as the virtues flowering forth from Pentateuchal righteousness.[25]

The contrast will at once be felt between this picture which is, on the whole, favorable, and that given by the Gospels and Paul. Undoubtedly not all reached the standard set for them then any more than all do now. The Pharisee[26] in the temple was not sincere, and unquestionably there were others like him. But they were not the predominant class, as we are sometimes tempted to believe from the reports of Jesus' condemnations. The reproaches of a reformer can never be entirely unprejudiced, for as a usual thing he does not consider the nobler elements of the system attacked, but lays his emphasis on the abuses. This can hardly fail to give a later generation an entirely erroneous picture. In considering the clash between Jesus and the Pharisees Christian prejudice should not blink the patent fact that Jesus misunderstood the Pharisees—and especially the scribes—as completely as they did him. Nor should it be overlooked that the preservation of these bitter attacks on the Pharisees was due to their polemic value to the later Christians in their combats with the Jews. Words of reproach rarely lose heat in the process of repetition, particularly if they are thoroughly enjoyed. The godly scribe whom Jesus commends[27] stands as a protest against the wholesale condemnation of the race.

---

[24] *I.e.* גילוי עריות, one of the three cardinal sins of later Judaism which might never be committed. Under the most stringent circumstances, as when a Jew faced execution during the days of Hadrian, a conference of rabbis at Lydda decided that any of the other demands of Torah might for the moment be set aside. These three: recognition of heathenism (עבודה זרה), shedding of blood (שפיכת דמים), and the sins of a sexual nature, as incest (גילוי עריות), might never be yielded. Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i, pp. 466 f. This reveals the abhorrence the Jew felt at such irregularities and goes far toward explaining Paul's attitude.

[25] Hirsch, art. "Ethics," *Jewish Encyclopedia*, v, p. 247.

[26] Luke 18:11 ff.

Such was Paul's heritage. These were the ideals which were held before him from an early date and which molded his thought in the realm of morals. Years later he might reject the whole Jewish system as evil; yet his outlook on life, his reaction to conditions, and his ways of thought bear significant testimony to the influence which the sturdy Jewish morality exerted in the formative days of the lad from Tarsus. There is every reason to believe that before his conversion Paul's outlook on life was that of the normal Jew, though we know almost nothing regarding him before the period of his literary activity.

That he was a Jew of orthodox parents, though possessing the prized Roman citizenship and brought up in the Greek city of Tarsus;[28] that he was strict almost to fanaticism in the keeping of Torah and in prizing the traditions of his race; that in the interpretation of the law he followed the teaching of the Pharisees; and that he joined in persecuting the Christians—constitute our meager knowledge of his pre-Christian days.[29] The problem of his rabbinic training is another matter. He himself makes no mention of it, nor do his writings bear the slightest trace, so far as I can see, of any technical halakic training. His fondness for atomistic interpretation of the Old Testament and his fanciful exegesis[30]—since this latter is called "rabbinic" of course everyone who indulged was a rabbi—prove nothing and may easily have been acquired through familiarity with the Jewish synagogue service, to say nothing of reading an author like Philo.[31]

---

[27] Mark 12:28–34.

Then came his conversion. There is a temptation to read too much into this event. That at the time we meet him as the apostle to the Gentiles Paul had broken with Judaism is obvious. But we are too prone to neglect the fact that many colorful years had elapsed between the conversion of Saul and the appearance of the Paul that we know from the epistles. There is, in short, the temptation to take the view that Paul was converted to Paulinism—if I may so phrase it—rather than the much more probable one that his break with the Jewish law, and that the rise of his own peculiar and highly developed system of beliefs, were the product of many years with their unfolding experiences. There is not the slightest evidence that Paul was dissatisfied with the Jewish law before his conversion; that he "longed to be 'righteous' " and strove, but in vain, to find peace by "exact fulfilment of legal requirement"; that "like Luther, [he] found no peace in the most exact ritual correctness"; that "suddenly he saw God in Christ Jesus, no longer as stern law-giver, but as Redeeming Father, and entered upon the freedom of loving sonship.[32]

---

[28] These two elements—Roman citizenship and connection with Tarsus—are unnoticed in Paul's letters. Our only source of information is the book of Acts, *viz.*, 16:37, 38; 22:25 ff.; 9:11.

[29] Phil. 3:4 ff.; Gal. 1:13 f.; I Cor. 15:9.

[30] *E.g.*, I Cor. 9:8 ff.; 10:1–13; II Cor. 3:13; Gal. 3:16; 4:21 ff.

[31] For a recent discussion of the whole problem of Paul's connection with Jerusalem, see my article, "Paul and Gamaliel," in the *Journal of Religion*, vii, no. 4, July, 1927, pp. 360–375.

As we have seen from our brief survey of Jewish ethics, such an attitude would have been completely alien to a normal Jew of that day with whom the keeping of Torah was a natural religious experience and not fraught with frantic effort and despairing doubt. On the contrary, in this period of his life Paul was probably perfectly satisfied with the law and prized it even more than did his fellows.[33] Rom. 7:14 ff., which is usually cited in support of the view under criticism, is almost certainly not to be interpreted autobiographically as giving Paul's own experience under the law, but as uttered by him as a paradigm of life as he later came to see it (many years after his conversion) and thrown into the first person in the customary style of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe.[34] Phil. 3:4–6, which Professor Hall quotes in support of his view, reflects Paul's outlook at the close of his life.

---

[32] This commonly accepted view, championed (among others) by T. C. Hall, *History of Ethics within Organized Christianity* (1910), p. 70, from which book the foregoing quotations are taken, appears to me entirely artificial and due to an attempt to read back to the moment of conversion, and before, an attitude which if ever reached came only during the course of a lifetime's work and opposition.

[33] Gal. 1:14.

While the conversion was the turning-point in Paul's life, it was apparently of a very different character. It was simply that Paul became convinced—how we do not know—that Jesus, far from being accursed of God, had but done the Father's will; that he had actually risen from the dead and was now sitting at the right hand of God, and would soon come again to judgment. This was the content of the early Christian preaching; this was the view he had been attacking; in all probability this became his early message.[35]

Justification by faith, salvation through Jesus' death, faith, and all the other elements of his later thinking were gradually developed from various sources and experiences. It seems reasonable to think the alienation that increased until Paul could break with the law as completely as he seems to do in Phil. 3 was brought about in no small measure by the opposition of his fellow countrymen with whom for many weary years he had been in constant conflict as he strove among the Gentiles.[36]

---

[34] For a fuller discussion of Paul's use of this form of hortatory address, see pp. 41 ff.

[35] Cf. Gal. 1:23, "He that once persecuted us now preacheth the faith of which he once made havoc."

[36] Cf., *e.g.*, I Thes. 2:16.

The hostility to the law which he manifested in Galatians was due in no small part to the attitude of the Judaizing Christians who were poaching on his preserves. To discuss in detail the gradual alienation of Paul from Judaism and his increasing hostility to the law would be beyond the bounds of this present work—even if we had sufficient data for it—but this brief statement has seemed necessary to guard against the common mistake of assuming that from the first Paul was alien to the Judaism which produced him, and that its influence upon him was *nil*.

Boyhood influences are not easily laid aside. The wise historian will never overlook them. Owing to a development—mental, or spiritual, or whatever one may choose to call it—Paul could come to deny every precept of Judaism, could distort it and paint it in colors that no Jew would ever accept, yet it had laid hold of him, had molded his thought in his plastic days, and had predetermined in no small measure his outlook on life. The Old Testament—Jewish Scripture—was his Bible; its ideals were his ideals. He might feel that Judaism had been false to these ideals, yet the point remains that precisely the ideals which Paul came to believe were realized only in the Christian and were demanded by the union with Christ rather than through the command of the law were held by the Jew as his standard.

Again Paul stands the uncompromising Jewish monotheist with complete intolerance for all other gods and idolatry. Surely here he rang true to his inheritance, for whatever may have been Israel's view of other gods in the Canaanitish days, yet for Judaism all other gods were idols. And his was a God-centered system. Morality and religion were indissolubly linked. Sin was rebellion against God. The goal in life was final acquittal before God's judgment bar. His views on morality were lofty and pure. In a pagan world of sexual laxity he proclaimed the need of the strictest observance of moral purity. The Christian was free from the law, but freedom never meant license.

Again, as we shall see, he laid constant emphasis on the need of a Christian group-spirit and the observance of the social virtues; on the necessity of unity and brotherly kindness—all stressed by Judaism. Christians constituted the true spiritual Israel; they were the true children of Abraham. These figures would hardly have been employed by a Greek or a Roman.

How this heritage affected his specific teaching, how in part it shines through his words unchanged, how at other times it is ignored, modified, or actually reversed—all these considerations we shall do well to reserve until the discussion of Paul's specific teachings; yet this preliminary statement may not be out of place at this point.

While we would be most unwise were we to neglect the influence of Greek thought, of Stoicism, or at least some of the Stoic ideals, of the Oriental mystery cults, and of Paul's own personal contribution—all of which, as we shall see, were of prime importance—yet Sabatier is probably not far from the truth when he says:

> It is not the citizen of Tarsus but the Pharisee of Jerusalem . . . which explains the apostle to the Gentiles.[37]

---

[37] Sabatier, *L'apôtre Paul* (1881), p. 27. Yet Sabatier tends to over-emphasize the matter of Paul's rabbinic training, and fails to appreciate the influence that Greek thought had upon him.

In the preceding chapter I have tried to indicate the kind of heritage that Paul received from Judaism and the lasting influence which it exerted upon him in spite of his later abandonment of the law and his rejection of Judaism. But there are other factors which must be considered. Though a Jew by birth and education, Paul lived in the Hellenistic world, was familiar with Greek thought, wrote excellent Greek, and above all felt himself under obligation to God to proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles.[1] The task of presenting Jesus to the Gentiles in a way which they would accept compelled Paul to adopt such phraseology and modes of expression as would be intelligible to them.

All this is mirrored in his epistles, which contain a considerable amount of material seemingly alien to his Jewish upbringing and reminiscent of his Greek environment. Not alone similarities of phrase, but types of thought more or less paralleled in the writings of Greek moralists of that period—chiefly Stoic—are readily recognized. At once then the question is raised: To what extent was Paul influenced by the life and thought about him, by the cults and philosophies with which the Hellenistic world teemed? Did he consciously bor-

[1] Rom. 1:14.

row, and if so to what extent? Can the similarities and parallels be explained on other grounds, being in themselves insufficient to establish any probability of direct influence upon Paul or of conscious borrowing on his part, as being due to his having lived in a similar thought world and having used a language tinctured by phrases which by his time had become common property and which might perfectly well have been acquired by listening to conversations in the market places?

Widely different answers greet this question. Nor is this strange. Positive statement is exceedingly difficult. For our purpose we are not primarily concerned with "Paulinism" as a whole, including his theology and doctrines, except in so far as they directly contribute to an understanding of his moral teachings. Accordingly, our problem resolves into the question: To what extent was Paul influenced in his ethical teachings (1) by the contemporary Oriental mystery cults which offered to their initiates salvation through a redeemer-god, who had died and had been raised, (2) by the pagan moralists? In the latter class we need hardly go beyond Stoicism, for by the time of Paul Stoicism had become so thoroughly eclectic as to represent about all Greek thought.[2]

Epicureanism, the only rival to Stoicism, was an abomination to every Jew on account of its reputed atheism and emphasis on pleasure as the *summum bonum* of life. It could hardly have been expected to have exerted any real influence upon Paul. In fact, we

[2] Cf. Toussaint, *L'hellénisme et l'apôtre Paul*, p. 301.

find absolutely no trace of it in his writings except in one sentence, and that a saying quoted in sarcasm.[3]

"To live conformably to nature" was generally recognized by all Greek philosophers as being the end for man and the fundamental requirement for all moral action. Cicero had said, "If we will follow nature as our guide, we will never go astray" (Quam [*sc.* naturam] sequemur ducem, numquam aberrabimus),[4] a sentiment which even the Epicurean would have accepted. The disagreement lay in what conformity to nature actually was. The Epicurean with his heritage from Aristippus the Cyrenaic said *pleasure*, of which the senses were to be the judges.[5] Pleasure was the goal; virtue a means of attaining it. Knowledge was stressed, for Aristippus was a true disciple of Socrates, but it was not the goal for him as it was for his master; its value lay in being a means to pleasure.

The Stoic,[6] too, stressed conformity to nature as the great end in life. So Seneca, "We have a habit of saying that the highest good is to live according to nature";[7]

---

[3] I Cor. 15:32.

[4] *de Officiis* i, 28, 100 and often; cf. M. Aurel. 2, 17 (end) οὐδὲν δὲ κακὸν κατὰ φύσιν.

[5] "Sensibus ipsis iudicari voluptates." Cic., *de Fin.* ii, 12, 36.

[6] Here the Stoics were following the lead of their forerunners, the Cynics, but while the Cynics interpreted life according to nature as the primitive and unsophisticated, and had accordingly been completely indifferent to all convention and, in many cases as Diogenes, even to decency, the Stoics conformed in the main to the current morality with special emphasis on duties to the state and family.

[7] Sen., *de Otio* 5 [31], 1.

or Epictetus, "But much more is it a law of life, that we must act conformably to nature."[8] But the Stoic differed radically from the Epicurean as to what this conformity meant. Virtue was stressed, but no longer as a means. It was in itself the end. Virtue was for virtue's sake. To practice good for its own sake, to do one's duty because it was his duty—this was the goal in life. Motives, not results, were to be considered. Though such a life might well bring happiness, it was incidental.

> As in a tilled field, when ploughed for corn, some flowers are found amongst it, and yet, though these posies may charm the eye, all this labor was not spent in order to produce them—the man who sowed the field had another object in view, he gained *this* over and above it—so pleasure is not the reward or cause of virtue, but comes in addition to it; nor do we choose virtue because she gives us pleasure, but she gives us pleasure also if we choose her.[9]

Montaigne has caught this attitude exactly in his free paraphrase,

> The old sailor thus said to Neptune in a mighty tempest, "O God, thou canst save me if thou wilt; thou canst destroy me if thou wilt; but whatever comes I will keep my rudder true."[10]

Thus for the Stoic the life of a man could be rendered happy by virtue alone and miserable only by wickedness.[11] Indeed pleasure might well be the very opposite of virtue:

---

[8] 1, 26, 1. Cf. similar phrases occurring, such as *ἀκολούθως τῇ φύσει, κατὰ φύσιν ζῆν, κατὰ λόγον ζῆν, λογικῶς ζῆν.*

[9] Sen., *de Vit. Beat.* 9, 2.

[10] *Essais*, bk. 2, chap. 16. He is referring to *Ep. Mor.* 85, 33. "Qui hoc potuit dicere, 'Neptune, numquam hanc navem nisi rectam,' arti satis fecit." Cf. also *ad Marc.* 6, 3, and especially the similar remarks of Teles, *καλῶς τὸ τοῦ κυβερνήτου, ἐκείνου ἀλλ' οὖν γε, ὦ Πόσειδον, ὀρθήν* (*Teletis Reliquiae*, ed.^{2} Hense, *περὶ ἀπαθείας* (1909), p. 62).

> You will find virtue in the temple, the market place, the senate house, manning the walls, covered with dust, sunburnt, horny-handed: You will find pleasure (*voluptas*) skulking out of sight, seeking for shady nooks at the public baths, hot chambers, and places which dread the visits of the ædile, soft, effeminate, reeking of wine and perfumes, pale or perhaps painted and made up with cosmetics.[12]

But virtue could be apprehended alone by the reason; the passions and desires were always diverting the attention to false goals. Accordingly, for the true Stoic, reason must be in control and must dry up the passions. For the Stoic, "to follow nature" came to mean "to overcome nature."[13] As Seneca remarked, "It is easier to banish dangerous passions than to subdue them."[14] And so the Stoic resolutely sought to uproot his passions and to allow nothing to disturb his tranquillity. He strove to view things dispassionately in the pure light of reason; to choose what he felt to be right, regardless of its effect upon himself or others.

> I will look upon death or upon a comedy with the same expression of countenance. I will submit to labors, however great they may be, supporting the strength of my body by that of my

---

[11] Here the Peripatetic would disagree. Life could be made miserable only by vice and wickedness, yet virtue was not sufficient to secure the happy life. The possession of one's proper limbs, health, a good person, an estate, good character, and the like were essential.

[12] Sen., *de Vit. Beat.* 7, 3.

[13] Sen., *de Brev.* 14, 2—"Disputare cum Socrate licet, dubitare cum Carneade, cum Epicuro quiescere, ***hominis naturam cum Stoicis vincere***, cum Cynicis excedere."

[14] *de Ira* 1, 7, 2; *Ep. Mor.* 85, 10.

> mind. I will despise riches when I have them as much as when I have them not. . . . Whether fortune comes or goes I will take no notice of her. . . . I will do nothing because of public opinion, but everything because of conscience. . . . In eating and drinking my object shall be to quench the desires of Nature, not to fill and empty my belly. I will be agreeable with my friends, gentle and mild to my foes. . . . Whenever either Nature demands my breath again, or reason bids me dismiss it, I will quit this life, calling all to witness that I have loved a good conscience and good pursuits; that no one's freedom, my own least of all, has been impaired through me.[15]

This was possible only by attaining a complete freedom from all affections and a complete independence of all affairs external to himself, over which accordingly he had no control.

> Of things, some are in our power and others not. In our power are opinion, pursuit, desire, aversion, and, in one word, whatever are our own actions. Not in our power are body, property, reputation, command, and, in one word, whatever are not our own actions.[16]

This reaches the center of Epictetus' teaching. Conduct consists in the proper regulation of the will; peace and freedom can result only when a man chooses the things that are his own (τὰ ἴδια) and refuses to let himself be shaken, come what may.[17]

Property may be taken from him; it was not his, anyway. His loved ones may die; he thanks God they were spared him so long.

---

[15] Sen., *de Vit. Beat.* 20, 3–5. These excerpts from his rules for life give a clear picture of the ἀπάθεια of the wiseman.

[16] Epict., *Ench.* 1, 1.

[17] Cf. Sen., *Ep. Mor.* 85, 40.

> To guard what is our own, not to claim what belongs to others; to use what is given us; not to long for anything if it is not given; if anything be taken away, to give it up at once and without a struggle with gratitude for the time it has been enjoyed,[18]

this was for Epictetus the law of nature (ὁ νόμος ὁ θεῖος).

> . . . When the tyrant says to a man, "I will chain your leg," he who values his leg says, "Nay, have mercy"; but he who values his will says, "If it seem more profitable to you, chain it.[19]

> O Crito, if it thus pleases the gods, thus let it be. Anytus and Melitus may kill me indeed, but hurt me they cannot.[20]

This man is truly free, and as one released from slavery he can look up to God and say:

> Deal with me hereafter as thou wilt. I am as one with thee; I am equal with thee. I flinch from nothing so long as thou thinkest it good. Lead me where thou wilt. Put on me what raiment thou wilt. Wouldst thou have me hold office or eschew it; stay or fly, be poor or rich? For all this I will defend thee before man. I will show what each thing really is.[21]

These words are not to be thought of as spoken in the way a Jew might have uttered them to his God who had the right to demand such an attitude. Much confusion results from apostrophes like this with which both Seneca and Epictetus abound. It must be borne clearly in mind that they are not to be understood as voluntary reverence and submission to a personal God, such as Paul often expresses, but on the contrary reveal the Stoic's struggle to become free and independent. In this struggle alone could virtue find itself. Nor was the burden of the battle endured because of any desire to please God or because he ordered it. It was endured solely because reason demanded it. Regardless of the personal apostrophes or even the lyrical rhapsody,

---

[18] Epict. 2, 16, 28.

[19] Epict. 1, 19, 8; cf. also 1, 24, 12 f.; 1, 25, 30 ff.

[20] Epict. *Ench.* 52, 3. With this should be compared Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i, 2, 4—ὑμεῖς δ'ἀποκτεῖναι μὲν δύνασθε, βλάψαι δ' οὔ.

[21] Epict. 2, 16, 42.

> For what else can I, a lame old man, do but sing hymns to God? If I were a nightingale, I would act the part of a nightingale; if a swan, the part of a swan. But since I am a reasonable creature (λογικός), it is my duty to sing hymns to God. This is my task. I do it. Nor will I desert this post so long as it is granted to me; and I exhort you to join in the same song—[22]

the Stoic is conscious of no personal God to whom he owes reverence and love. Sonship to God did not mean for him personal relationship, but that man shared the rational life of God and should see in the workings of the universe the acts of divine Providence. Seneca expressed precisely this same thought of struggle for independence, but in a way that is free from ambiguity:

> Or we may choose to define it (*i.e.* the *summum bonum* of life) by calling that man happy who knows good and bad only in the form of good or bad minds: who worships honor and is satisfied with his own virtue, who is neither puffed up by good fortune nor cast down by evil fortune, who knows no other good than that which he is able to bestow upon himself, whose real pleasure lies in despising pleasure.[23]

So it follows that for the Stoic there could be no consciousness of sin. "All men have erred;" but that meant "missing the mark," falling short of the ideal of the perfect man, running counter to the laws of the universe. It was not an offense or unfilial act of defiance to a loving, gracious Father.[24] In fact, sin is rather an error of judgment.

---

[22] Epict. 1, 16, 15–21.

[23] *de Vit. Beat.* 4, 2.

> So henceforth when we do a thing wrong we shall blame nothing else but the judgment which led us to do it, and we shall strive to remove and extirpate this.[25]

> Ignorance . . . becomes the cause of all sins.[26]

It is not something deep rooted in their character:

> Only show them their errors and you will see how they desist from their faults.[27]

These examples (with the ones referred to in the note), which could be endlessly multiplied, are sufficient to illustrate this point of view. In the interview with Nicodemus[28] a view essentially the same as the Greek is stressed, "Except one be born anew he cannot see the kingdom of God." Errors of judgment may be so deep seated as to require a new nature, but nevertheless they are *errors*, not conscious acts of disobedience. This view is perpetuated in such modern phrases as "sick souls." On the other hand, a good illustration of what for convenience may be called the Jewish view is found in the parable of the Prodigal Son.[29] The youth has flagrantly flouted the father's will; he must repent and go home. This is the prophetic note "Cease to do evil; learn to do well."[30]

---

[24] It is often pointed out as a defect in the Stoic system that they recognized no degree in vice. This is perfectly true. Motives, not results, were important. Intention, not achievement, constituted success. Any choice of wrong goal, every misdeed, regardless of relative importance, was disastrous. But was this limited to Stoicism? Is there not a theological dictum that all sin since directed against an infinite being is of infinite guilt? Horace defends a gradation of guilt (*Sat.* i, 3, 115–117):

> "Nec vincet ratio hoc, tantundem ut peccet idemque,
> Qui teneros caules alieni fregerit horti,
> Et qui nocturnus sacra divum legerit."

[25] Epict. 1, 11, 35.

[26] Philo, *de Ebrietate* xxxix (§160) 382M.

[27] Epict. 1, 18, 4: cf. also 2, 12, 4; 2, 26, 5; M. Aurel. 2, 1; 7, 22 and 63; 11, 18.

[28] John 3:1–15.

Improvement was not a sudden change, but a gradual and slow advance. Both Seneca and Epictetus stress the need of daily examination of the events of the day before going to sleep:

> Never let sleep come to thy languid eyes before you have considered each of the doings of the day "Where have I slipped? What done, what failed to do?" Begin thus and go through all and chide thyself for thy shameful acts; rejoice over the good.[31]

The figure of the *wiseman* was ever before the Stoic's eyes as the goal, but gradually the ideal had become so lofty as hardly to admit of actual realization. Cicero had said:

> When, however, we ask who has ever attained to this ideal of theirs, they themselves, as a rule, do not attempt to answer.

Seneca:

> Where will you find him whom for so many centuries we have sought in vain?[32]

---

[29] Luke 15:11–32.

[30] Isa. 1:16 f.

[31] Epict. 3, 10, 2, quoted from the *Golden Verses* (Χρυσᾶ ἔπη 40–44) attributed to Pythagoras. Cf. also Sen., *de Ira* 3, 36, 1 f.

[32] Cic., *Acad.* ii, 47, 145; Sen., *de Tran. An.* 7, 4. Cf. also the similar view of Plutarch (*de Comm. Not.* 33, p. 1076B), "Nowhere and never has the Wise Man existed," and of Sextus Empiricus (ix, 133, p. 582), "The man who

When criticized for talking "more bravely than he lived," Seneca answered:

> I am not a wiseman, and I shall not be one to feed your spite: so do not require me to be on a level with the best of men, but merely to be better than the worst; I am satisfied, if every day I take away something from my vices and correct my faults. I have not arrived at perfect soundness of mind, indeed, I never shall arrive at it.[33]

It is not to be supposed that the Stoic condoned wrong-doing and immorality. No sect ever stressed purity of life more than they. The guiding motto for Epictetus' life was "Bear and forbear"—*ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου*, which is explained by Aulus Gellius:

> Epictetus was particularly wont to remark, as we have heard from Favorinus, that there were two vices above all others serious and dreadful, lack of endurance and lack of restraint, since we are so wont not to endure or bear injuries which must be borne, or to restrain ourselves from those affairs and pleasures wherein restraint is needful. "And so," said he, "if a man but take these two words to heart and pay them heed by discipline and care o'er self, he shall be completely free from sin and in possession of a tranquil life." These two words he spoke of were *ἀνέχου* and *ἀπέχου*.[34]

Impatience at immorality and unmanliness, abhorrence of unnatural lusts, sharp criticism of the adulterer,

---

fulfills their ideal of the Wise Man has not yet been found." I am indebted to G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga, *Radical Views about the New Testament*, p. 36, for these quotations.

[33] *de Vit. Beat.* 17, 3 f. It is interesting to observe that when this saying is quoted, as it often is, the words "to feed your spite" (*ut malivolentiam tuam pascam*) are regularly omitted though with no broken line to mark the omission. Whether this is due to apologetic purposes or to the failure to read the reference itself can only be surmised.

[34] *Noctes Atticae*, xvii, 19, 5 f. This sentiment found great favor with the later Stoics. Cf. M. Aurel, 5, 33.

are found running all through his writings.[35] Again and again we hear his stinging sarcasm:

> We think about ourselves as if we were nothing but bellies, guts, and *pudenda*.[36]

All this is contrary to the true nature of man, who is a part of the universe, a part of God, for, as Cleanthes had sung, "From thee our race comes."[37] Though the animals are part of God's world, yet they are

> not his principal works nor part of the Divine. But you are a principal work, a fragment of God himself; you have in yourself a part of him. Why, then, are you ignorant of your high birth? Why do you not know whence you have come? Will you not remember when you eat, who you are that eat and whom you are feeding; and the same in your relations with women? When you take part in society or training or conversation, do you not know that it is God you are nourishing and training? You bear God about with you, poor wretch, and know it not. Do you think I speak of some external god of silver or gold? No, you bear him about within you and are unaware that you are defiling him with unclean thoughts and foul action. If an image of God were present, you would not dare to do any of the things you do; yet when God himself is present within you and sees and hears all things, you are not ashamed of thinking and acting thus. O slow to understand your nature and estranged from God.[38]

The Stoic abhorrence of passion, and the resolute attempt to uproot all that in any manner might prevent a calm indifference to the vicissitudes of life, gave their whole teaching a note of hardness. Since the Stoic was under the guidance of reason, pity and sympathy were at once excluded.

---

[35] 2, 4 pass., 2, 8, 11 ff.; 3, 1, 28; 4, 9 pass.; and often.

[36] Epict. 1, 9, 26 and often.

[37] Hymn *In Jov.* 4. Whether the text should be ἐκ σοῦ or ἐκ τοῦ (Διὸς) is uncertain.

[38] Epict. 2, 8, 10–14.

> . . . Good men will show mercy (*clementia*) and mildness but will avoid pity (*misericors*), which is a vice incident to weak minds which cannot endure the sight of another's sufferings. . . . Pity considers a man's misfortunes and does not consider to what they are due; mercy is combined with reason. . . . Pity is a disorder of the mind caused by the sight of other men's miseries. . . . Nothing becomes a man more than magnanimity; but magnanimity cannot coexist with sorrow.[39]

Undoubtedly the criticism of harshness was raised then as now, and in a truly noble chapter of the *de Clementia* Seneca sought to answer this criticism and to show that, while pity was a form of weakness and hence a vice which negatived justice, the true Stoic was ever ready to "do willingly and high-mindedly all that those who feel pity were wont to do."[40] "He will dry the tears of others, but will not mingle his own with theirs."[41] Even in Epictetus, though he describes the life of the Cynic[42]—the ideal philosopher—as one of continuous devotion to his fellows, there is a note of hardness: No rational man can feel pity, for physical misery is nothing, while spiritual misery is strictly personal—no one else can remove it. Nor is this attitude essentially altered in his half-grudging concession:

---

[39] Sen., *de Clem.* 2, 5, 1–4.

[40] *de Clem.* 2, 6, 2; cf. also *Ep. Mor.* 104, 3 et pass.

[41] *Ibid.* Contrast Rom. 12:15.

[42] See 3, 22 for a full discussion of the Cynic, his duties and privileges.

> . . . If you must harbor unnatural feelings at the misfortunes of another, pity him rather than hate him;[43]

or again:

> So far as words go, however, do not disdain to adapt yourself to him (συμπεριφέρεσθαι), and even, if it should happen, to groan with him. Take heed, however, not to groan inwardly, too.[44]

Again, the wise man cannot pardon, for "pardon is the remitting of a deserved penalty"[45] and hence runs counter to justice; but though he will not remit any penalty that he should exact—for that would be a neglect of duty—he suits the punishment to the guilt, and does all in the spirit of mercy. Yet it should not be supposed that refusal to forgive comes from anger or desire for revenge, "for it is the part of a great mind to despise wrongs done to it." The Stoic lives in the world, but is not of the world; moves about among the rest of mankind, but in perfect serenity untroubled by their foibles, unaffected by their puerile insults, refusing to become angry: "But there is no ground for your anger. Ignore them; they are all mad."[46] It need hardly be pointed out that this verse which has been often cited as a Stoic parallel to Luke 23:24, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," is precisely the reverse, and is spoken in half contemptuous pity as one would treat silly children.

Yet while the Stoic lives an essentially self-centered life of contemplation, man was by nature a social being

---

[43] 1, 18, 9.

[44] *Ench.* 16; cf. 1, 18, 19.

[45] Sen., *de Clem.* 2, 7, 1.

[46] *de Benef.* 5, 17, 3.

(ζῷον κοινώνικον)[47] and could not fulfill his true nature without realizing his social relationships and responsibilities to family and state. "I am a man; nothing in man's lot do I deem foreign to me."[48] Epicurus taught that on the whole a man would do better not to marry, nor beget children, nor engage in any public affairs, because those things disturbed his tranquillity;[49] the Stoics, on the contrary, urged that a man marry, bring up a family, and perform all his duties as a citizen.[50] Of course, since in the last analysis all these were secondary, and virtue alone good, should a clash come, the choice must inevitably be virtue. In a manner "free from passion and disquiet" he is to behave as is fitting toward "the gods, his parents, brothers, country, and foreigners."[51] He is to realize that not only has he an obligation to his own city and should engage in its life and serve it if called upon, but also he has a higher duty to *the great city* (ἡ μεγάλη πόλις), that is, to the universe (ὁ κόσμος).[52]

> Let us grasp the fact that there are two republics, one vast and truly "public," which contains alike gods and men, in which we do not take account of this or that nook of land, but make the boundaries of our state reach as far as the rays of the sun; and another to which we have been assigned by the accident of birth.[53]

---

[47] Epict. 2, 10, 14. Cf. 2, 20, 13; 4, 5, 17; M. Aurel. 3, 4.

[48] Terence, *Heaut.* 1, 1, 54. This is quoted with approval by Seneca, *Ep. Mor.* 95, 53.

[49] Cf. Epict. 1, 23, passim.

[50] For Epictetus' view that "as the state of things now is" the Cynic would do well to refrain from marriage see p. 188.

[51] Epict. 2, 17, 31; 3, 7, 26; 3, 21, 5.

[52] Cf., among other passages, Epict. 2, 5, 26.

[53] Sen., *de Otio* 4 [31], 1; cf. also *Ep. Mor.* 7, 4.

M. Aurelius sounds the same note:

> . . . My city and country, as Antoninus, is Rome; as a man, it is the universe.[54]

Nothing must be allowed to jeopardize this tranquil existence, wherein all unruly passion had been subdued and reason ruled supreme. When conditions arose making this state of calm no longer possible, there was the way of escape. Suicide was the open door. Nor was this opposed to the ideas of providence:

> The best thing eternal law ever did was that it granted us but one entrance to life, but many exits.[55]

Any vein in his body leads to liberty, so it is a man's own fault if he allows himself to suffer.[56] "Who can be forced has not learned to die."[57] Epictetus is rather more cautious in his statements here than Seneca: Stay where you are; depart not without reason. Wait upon God until he releases you;[58] yet in the last resort remember the door is open and you may leave the game.[59]

Such was Stoicism—a truly noble teaching. It is impossible to read Seneca and Epictetus and M. Aurelius without feeling the power for good that they present, the lofty goals to which they aspired, the uncompromising and courageous stand they made in an age of self-seeking and crooked policy. Yet Stoicism could not exert a lasting influence. The standard set was too high for many to realize. "Refrain from all thy will cannot control," "practise thyself in the following of the guidance of reason," "resist all passion," were not teachings for the multitudes. The market place preacher with his sturdy and practical demand for morality must have had a tonic effect, but did little to recruit new converts. The Stoic, as Epictetus, might consider himself a missionary to a lost world, but there was little proselyting zeal. Cosmopolitanism and equality, while preached, became to all intents and purposes mere terms. The ideal Stoic was one like Cato, stern, impassive, isolated: The world is mad; let us not bother with it. Actually Stoicism became a religion of despair. In Lightfoot's happy phrase it was a "staff of professors without classes," and these professors were chiefly engaged in personal research problems. Their ideals were lofty and altruistic in theory, but since they themselves were so often wanting in a real human sympathy, they failed to exert the influence that the nobility of their ideals warranted and which they themselves earnestly strove to effect. There will always be a few in every age to whom their words will come with tonic force, to whom the challenge of the virtuous life with no reward save virtue itself will inspire to service, for whom a future squaring of accounts will seem entirely unnecessary; but of necessity such a path is not for all, "for narrow is the gate, and straightened the way . . . and few are they that find it."

---

[54] 6, 44.

[55] *Ep. Mor.* 70, 14. Cf. *de Ira* 3, 15, 3 f.; *de Prov.* 6, 7 ff.

[56] *de Ira* 3, 15, 4; but see also *Ep Mor.* 104, 3.

[57] Sen., *Herc. Fur.* 426.

[58] 1, 9, 12–17.

[59] 1, 24, 20; cf. 1, 25, 18; Horace, *Epp.* ii, 2, 213 ff. It need hardly be remarked that II Cor. 1:8 f. contains no reference to a contemplated suicide, a subject completely alien to Paul's thought.

Is there sufficient evidence to justify the widely held view of dependence on the part of Paul upon contemporary Stoic ethics? The answer is most difficult. That Paul had ever studied Stoic writings there does not seem to be a shred of evidence. The words in Acts,[60] "As certain of your own poets have said, 'For we are also his offspring,'" prove nothing. This verse of Aratus[61] must have been familiar to everyone who had heard a street-corner Stoic preacher. Paul's episode in Athens, accepting the story as it stands, cannot be adduced as evidence of even a working knowledge of Stoic teaching. Paul, far from being successful in his attempt to present Christian truths in a philosophical dress, completely failed. It does not require a great strain of imagination to see in Paul's word to the Corinthians about the folly of the wise, and that "in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God," but that it was God's good pleasure to save the world "through the foolishness of preaching," a reminiscence of his recent one and only attempt to present the gospel in a different form, and its signal failure. Accordingly, this story, if used at all, must not be employed to prove that Paul was familiar enough with the Stoics to meet them on their ground. He may have tried it, but with complete discomfiture. But throughout his epistles are phrases which sound strangely similar to those in Stoic authors: "That God may be all in all"[62] is just the type of expression which must have occurred constantly in the diatribe. The citations in Wettstein make probable that this was a popular idiom.[63] Again, "For of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things"[64] should be compared with M. Aurelius' word, "All things come from thee, subsist in thee, go back to thee."[65] The figure of life as warfare[66] constantly recurs in the writings of both Paul and Seneca. "And I will most gladly spend and be spent for your souls"[67] should be compared with "Good men labor, spend and are spent, and that too of their own free will."[68] Paul's comparison of the two athletes—one for the mortal crown, the other for the immortal one[69] is quite similar to one Seneca makes;[70] while the words, "by glory and dishonor, by evil report and good report; as deceivers and yet true; as unknown and yet well known; as dying, and behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things."[71] show similarities with many passages in Stoic writers express-

---

[60] Acts 17:28.

[61] *Phaenom.* 5; cf., Cleanthes, Hymn *In Jov.* 4, ἐκ σοῦ (τοῦ?) γένος ἐσμεν.

Give examples

---

[62] I Cor. 15:28.

[63] Cf. Macrobius, *Sat.* i, 20, 11, where it is said that Hercules was "the in-all-and-through-all sun" (τὸν ἐν πᾶσι καὶ διὰ πάντων ἥλιον).

[64] Rom. 11:28.

[65] 4, 23.

[66] See pp. 229 f.

[67] II Cor. 12:15.

[68] Sen., *de Prov.* 5, 4 ("Boni viri laborant, impendunt, impenduntur et volentes quidem").

[69] I Cor. 9:25.

[70] *Ep. Mor.* 78, 16.

[71] II Cor. 6:8–10.

ing the unconcern one should have for external possessions or comforts. In connection with these words the description by Epictetus of the true Stoic is instructive:

> Show me a man who is sick and happy, in danger and happy, dying and happy, in exile and happy, in disgrace and happy.[72]

More of these parallels will naturally be examined in the discussion of Paul's ethics as such; for the present these instances seem sufficient.[73] And really they prove surprisingly little. For the man who is moderately familiar with Stoicism it is possible in a rapid reading of the authors—especially in a translation made by scholars acquainted with the New Testament—to amass a considerable number of phrases of which expression in Paul's writings seem "reminiscent," or at least in harmony. Such evidence, while valuable, is not to be used to prove dependence. Paul lived in a thought world essentially Greek. He spoke and wrote good Greek. While the proselyting power of Stoicism was probably small, yet, due to the market place preachers and the public readings from the Stoic poets, modes of expression, catch phrases, and the like may well have influenced the common speech; while more conspicuous teachings of the Stoa, such as the concept of the "wise man," complete indifference to all save virtue, and the like were known, at least in ridicule. So Paul most probably acquired them. He took his truth where he found it; a happy phrase that expressed his thought in pertinent manner he would naturally use. Indeed, his use of the Old Testament is instructive here. Again and again a word that he had written would seem to remind him of some phrase in the Old Testament in which that word occurred; accordingly, this phrase was quoted, regularly, with no regard for the Old Testament context. This must not be unduly stressed, for of course to Paul the Old Testament was entirely different from everything else. Every word of it was inspired. Accordingly, this "atomistic interpretation" was not only allowable, but natural. Yet, after all allowance has been made it is not improbable that a similar disregard of the original meaning is to be seen in his use of terms which would be familiar to his readers, and which he could easily have acquired in conversation. The phrase was timely and he took it. Gal. 5:23 may be a case in point. Paul's words κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος ("Against such there is no law") offer a striking parallel to Aristotle's utterance, κατὰ δὲ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστι νόμος, αὐτοὶ γάρ εἰσι νόμος ("Against such there is no law, for they themselves are a law").[74] The similarity is real, but does not justify the assumption of direct knowledge on the part of Paul of the writings of Aristotle. Nor does the inclusion of the prominent Aristotelian virtue ἐγκράτεια ("self-control") in the preceding verse heighten the probability. It is, of course, quite possible that it is a chance similarity incident to the discussion of a similar subject; on the other hand, it is not impossible that it had become a

---

[72] 2, 19, 24.

[73] If more are desired, they may be found in Lightfoot's essay, *St. Paul and Seneca*, in his commentary on Philippians, pp. 270–328, esp. pp. 287–290.

[74] *Pol.* iii, 13, 14 (p. 1284a). This similarity has also been observed by Peabody, *The Apostle Paul and the Modern World*, p. 48, n. 2.

popular saying, and that as such, since it was pertinent, Paul had employed it.

Some such explanation as this is necessary to account for the differences. If we were to feel that every phrase used by Paul which has a Stoic flavor was consciously borrowed from some Stoic teaching, we would be in hopeless confusion, for when we do not stop with the phrases themselves which seem similar, but read them in their contexts, very often we find them a diameter's distance apart, and with a complete contradiction on a near-by page. Though these words of Epictetus quoted on p. 36 remind one of Paul's "for I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therein to be content"[75]—in many respects Paul's nearest approach to Stoicism—his next phrase would never have been uttered by a Stoic, "I know how to be abased" (lit. "humbled"—ταπεινοῦσθαι). As is shown in a later chapter,[76] humility (ταπεινοφροσύνη) was a vice, not a virtue, in the eyes of the Stoic, a mean truckling. And again, Paul's contentment (αὐτάρκεια) was far removed from the unconcern (ἀπάθεια) aspired after by the Stoa. Evidence of dependence is not found by amassing proof texts, but on the basis of unity of purpose and the use of phrase and expression so strikingly unusual as to be explicable on no other basis. And of this we have little or no evidence in Paul. The similarities are precisely such as we would expect. Both Paul and the Stoic held the highest of moral standards, but Paul's abhorrence of immorality is completely and satisfactorily explained on the basis of his Jewish heritage.

---

[75] Phil. 4:11 ff.; cf. II Cor. 4:8 ff.

[76] Pp. 259 f.

It is often asserted that in his emphasis on freedom Paul borrowed a Stoic concept. It seems to me the point is not well taken. Freedom was of prime importance to the Stoic, indeed it was synonymous with virtue: "Freedom and slavery, the one is the name of virtue, and the other of vice."[77] It was of no less importance to Paul. That Paul, however, would not have talked about freedom as he did had not the Stoics previously taught it—which is what dependence means—seems most unlikely. For Freedom meant something quite different to Paul from what it did to the Stoic. For the latter:

> That man is free who lives as he wishes; who is proof against compulsion, hindrance, and violence; whose impulses are untrammeled; who gets what he wills to get, and avoids what he wills to avoid.[78]

For Paul: "For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ made me free from the law of sin and of death."[79] Freedom meant for him that all—Jew and Gentile alike with every wall of partition broken down—might be freed through faith in Christ from sin and necessity of keeping the Jewish law. Freedom was to be tempered by love and mutual forbearance: "For ye, brethren, were called for freedom; . . . through love be servants one to another."[80] Of himself he can say, "For though I was free from all men, I brought myself under bondage to all, *that I might gain the more.*"[81] The goal for the Stoic was to stand aloof in untroubled serenity on the mountain peak. His social interest became to all intents limited to the attempt to produce others like himself, able to take their stand on other mountain peaks; for Paul the goal was to unite all into a group of earnest men and women, united to their Lord by faith, and living in a manner worthy of him.

---

[77] Epict. *S*. 31 [in Eng. transl. usually *Fgm*. 7 or 8]; cf. also *S*. 36 (42); 3, 22, 84, et passim.

[78] Epict. 4, 1, 1; cf. Cicero, *Paradox*. 5.

[79] Rom. 8:2.

[80] Gal. 5:13.

The essential contrast between Paul and a Stoic like Seneca is revealed by a comparison of two passages which have much in common. Seneca says: "Nature bids me do good to mankind. What difference does it make if they be slaves or freemen, free-born or emancipated, whether their freedom be legally acquired or bestowed by arrangement among friends? Wherever there is a human being there is an opportunity for a benefit."[82] Paul: "For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bound nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus."[83]

Seneca's concern is for the man himself. What folly it is to look down upon a slave. All men are slaves, one to passions, another to hate, all to fear. We are to remember that present freedom is no proof of future security: "Do you not know at what age Hecuba entered captivity, or Crœsus, or the mother of Darius, or Plato, or Diogenes?"[84] Accordingly, in his contacts with his fellows he will be completely indifferent to their station because duty demands such an attitude in a free-born mind.[85]

---

[81] I Cor. 9:19.

[82] *de Vit. Beat.* 24, 3.

[83] Gal. 3:24–28.

Paul's view is that through union with Christ all distinctions are done away. All have become sons of Christ, linked to Christ. Contempt or a feeling of superiority or lack of forbearance is unthinkable in such a situation, not because it is unworthy of the man who shows it, or disturbs his serenity, or even is contrary to reason, but because it is directed against a brother for whom Christ died, and strikes a death blow at the whole structure of Christian fellowship.

The difference of attitude is fundamental. When appreciated, it puts one on one's guard against assuming that verbal similarities necessarily entail identity of thought.

The question of Paul's possible indebtedness to the Stoics for his use of the word συνείδησις (conscience) may be more conveniently discussed in a later chapter.[86] But in one respect Paul shows a marked Stoic influence—not in a matter of thought or phrase, but in the mode of expression. Paul must have been perfectly familiar with the Cynic-Stoic diatribe,[87] which in his time was the Hellenistic form of popular address. Undoubtedly he had listened to them countless times. Accordingly, when he preached he would be well-nigh compelled to use this medium. In his letters[88] we find many traces of just this style, even as we do in Seneca and Epictetus. The series of short, staccato questions[89] often with the familiar "God forbid" (μὴ γένοιτο);[90] the opposer at times assuming the position of the one opposed;[91] the use of expressions like "Be not deceived" (μὴ πλανᾶσθε);[92] direct address often in harsh tone: "O foolish Galatians" (ὦ ἀνόητοι Γαλάται)[93] "O man" (ἄνθρωπε),[94] "Thou foolish one" (ἄφρων)[95]—these and many other modes of expression habitually used in the diatribe are found in Paul's letters. Vituperative abuse which often characterized the Cynic diatribe,[96] the coarseness, vulgarity, and desire to arouse a laugh at the expense of the one attacked are lacking, yet the fact that Paul adopted this universally accredited method of popular hortatory address cannot be doubted.

---

[84] *Ep. Mor.* 47, 12; cf. *de Tran.* 11, 8–12.

[85] *de Vit. Beat.* 24, 3.

[86] See pp. 98 ff.

[87] See Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe;* Heinrici, *Der litterarische Charakter der neutestamentlichen Schriften,* pp. 60–71; Toussaint, *L'hellénisme et l'apôtre Paul,* pp. 277–284; Ropes, *ICC James,* pp. 10–16; Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur,* pp. 75–96.

---

[88] For example, Rom. 7:7 ff., the interpretation of which suffers from the failure to recognize this elemental fact.

[89] Rom. 3:1, 3, 9, 27 ff.; 4:1, 3; 6:1, 15; 7:7, 13; 8:31; 9:14; I Cor. 4:7, 21; 5:12; 6:15; 7:18, 27; 9:1; 10:19; II Cor. 11:21 ff.; 29 f.; 12:18; Gal. 1:10; 3:19, and often.

[90] Rom. 3:4, 6, 31; 6:2, 15; 7:7, 13; 9:14; 11:1, 11; I Cor. 6:15; Gal. 2:17; 3:21. This is very frequent in Epictetus; cf. 1, 1, 13; 1, 2, 35; 1, 5, 10; 1, 8, 15; 1, 9, 32; 1, 11, 23; 1, 12, 10; 1, 19, 7; 1, 26, 6; 1, 28, 19; 1, 28, 24; 1, 29, 9; 2, 8, 2 (ter.); 2, 8, 26; 2, 23, 23 (bis); 3, 1, 42; 3, 7, 4; 3, 17, 4; 3, 23, 13; 3, 23, 25; 3, 24, 101; 3, 24, 113; 4, 7, 27; 4, 8, 26; 4, 11, 24; 4, 11, 33; 4, 11, 36.

[91] Rom. 7; Gal. 3:19, 21.

[92] I Cor. 6:9; 15:33; Gal. 6:7.

[93] Gal. 3:1.

[94] Rom. 2:1, 3; 9:20.

[95] I Cor. 15:36.

[96] G. A. Gerhard, *Phoinix von Kolophon* (1909), pp. 25–39, quoted by Ropes, *ICC James*, p. 16.

This will all appear to different students of Paul in different ways. Probably no two will ever completely agree as to just what effect various elements of his life and world had upon him. That Stoicism had some influence is probable, but for thinking that it directly influenced him in any of his fundamental purposes or motives we have in my judgment no sufficient evidence. To a limited extent its ideas were known; to a rather greater extent its ethical phrases had become common property. Paul spoke the language of men and used those phrases that best suited his purpose. But there is no evidence that the dependence was greater. He had a message that dominated his life; he was under obligation to God to preach it to men; it was the gift of life; men were dying without it. Any means that would enable him to reach men and win them for Christ he would gladly use. But he did not merely borrow. The terms he took he transformed. Regardless of what they had meant before, with him they took on a new character. His words meant what he wanted them to mean because his whole personality was behind what he wrote or said. It was as if they had undergone a chemical change. The elements are present in the compound, but can they be isolated?[97]

---

[97] It will be observed that no attention has been paid to the so-called correspondence of Paul and Seneca. These letters could hardly have arisen before the fourth century (Bardenhewer, *Patrologie*², pp. 100 f., Krüger, *Geschichte der altchristlicher Litteratur in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, p. 12) and are a

clumsy attempt to bring Seneca into the Christian fold. From an early date the lofty morality of Seneca's teaching led many to think of him as lacking little of being a Christian. Tertullian had even written, "Seneca saeper noster" (*de Anima* 20). Fleury in his study, *Saint Paul et Sénèque*, i, p. 14, remarks: "Meanwhile a curious thing which is almost equivalent to a declaration of adoption of Seneca into the number of the faithful is the mention of his name in the decisions of the Councils. Serving as a corallary to the opinion of the Fathers who class Seneca in their own number, the fourteenth canon of the tenth council of Tours (*i.e.*, 567 A.D.) invokes his word instead of a verse from the Bible or New Testament: *Aliqui laici, dum diversa perpetrant adulteria, hoc quod de se sciunt in aliis suspicantur; sicut ait Seneca, pessimum in eo vitium esse qui in id quo insanit, caeteros putat furere* (*Sacro-sancta concilia*, ed. Labbe et Cossart, Paris, 1671, vol. v, col. 856)." In Spain along with St. Peter and St. Paul, St. Seneca is represented in the antics of the marionettes as having a part in the Lord's passion. Apparently this custom is very old (Fleury, *op. cit.*, i, p. 289).

Chapter III—The Oriental Mystery Cults and Ethics

> The Oriental mysteries offered their votaries radiant perspectives of eternal happiness. Thus the focus of morality was changed. The aim became to realize the sovereign good in the life hereafter instead of in this world, as the Greek philosophy had done. No longer did man act in view of tangible realities, but to attain ideal hopes. Existence in this life was regarded as a preparation for a sanctified life, as a trial whose outcome was to be either everlasting happiness or everlasting pain. As we see, the entire system of ethical values was overturned.[1]

CUMONT'S acute observation reveals the necessity of considering the nature of the mystery cults and of raising the questions: To what extent, if at all, did this revamping of ethical values affect Paul? Are we justified in asserting any dependence, direct or indirect, upon them in his ethical teaching?

The problem of Paul's relation to the mystery cults which is still being warmly debated today is hardly our problem; nor is this the place to describe their worship in any detail even if we had sufficient material. Yet the fact that we find Paul constantly using phrases and ideas reminiscent of the jargon of the cults, such as *ἅγιοι, τέλειοι, μυστήριον, φῶς, ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος, μεμύημαι, πλήρωμα, κύριος* in his moral teachings necessitates some consideration.

But at this point we find a difficulty. We have seen that for Judaism morality and religion could never be dissociated. It was, therefore, a comparatively simple task to consider the ethical ægis of Judaism under which Saul of Tarsus grew up and to see various points of contact between the apostle and the faith he had abandoned.

---

[1] Cumont, *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism*, pp. xxii f.

Stoicism by the beginning of the Christian era, although nominally a philosophy, had almost entirely lost its speculative character. The emphasis of its street-corner preachers was upon practical morality. Indeed many historians today speak of Stoicism as being almost a religion. It was because of this that Hegel declared the writings of the Stoics to be no more worthy of a place in the history of philosophy than was the production of modern sermon-writers. Accordingly, it was perfectly possible to construct from the writings of its famous lights a more or less comprehensive sketch of Stoic ethics; and placing their moral teachings side by side with those of Paul, to compare their motives, and their goals, and to consider the question of relationship.

In these mystery cults, however, there was no connection between religion and morality. This is at once apparent from a consideration of the fundamental nature of the worship. The Greek μυστήριον is not the equivalent of the English word *mystery*. It was not something mysterious and vague; on the contrary, it was perfectly well known and clearly defined to the initiate to whom it had been revealed; it was a *secret* known only to the members of the cult. This secret had been made known to him in the initiation ritual by the two essential parts, *τὰ δρώμενα* and *τὰ λεγόμενα*—the "things done" and the "things said."[2]

There were many kinds of mystery cults in the world at the time of Paul, but, as Anrich[3] has pointed out, three characteristics were present in the case of all of them: (1) All have some rite of purification, either moral or ceremonial, through which the *Mystæ* pass. (2) All are mysteries of communion with some deity who through them comes into relation with his votaries. (3) All look to the future life and secure for the initiate a happy reception in the world beyond the grave.

This goal is expressed in the distich preserved by Firmicus Maternus,

> Be of good courage, ye initiates, because the God has been saved;
> To us also shall be salvation from woes.[4]

Here in essence is the gospel of all the mysteries. For the devotee the statement wrongly attributed to the Epicurean would be amended to, "Eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow you do not die at all—for you have been saved."

> As truly as Osiris lives, he shall also live; as truly as Osiris is not dead, shall he not die; as truly as Osiris is not annihilated, shall he not be annihilated.[5]

---

[2] C. H. Moore, *The Religious Thought of the Greeks*, p. 69.

[3] *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*, pp. 37-39.

[4] *de Errore 22*—

θαρρεῖτε μύσται τοῦ θεοῦ σεσωσμένου·
ἔσται γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐκ πόνων σωτηρία.

[5] Cumont, *op. cit.*, p. 100; cf. Erman, *Die ägyptische Religion*,[2] p. 111 [E. T. p. 95.]

Again, the goal aimed at was realized solely through the efficacy of the rites of initiation.

> Thrice blessed are they who have seen these rites and then go to the house of Hades, for they alone have life there; but all others have only woe.[6]

This at once reveals the cleft between religion and morality. The two need not be antagonistic, but salvation was not dependent upon purity of life or uprightness of conduct. The reception of the vows had guaranteed unconditionally the blessed fate after death.[7] This gave point to the sneer of Diogenes: "Pataicion the thief will have a better fate when he comes to die than will Epaminondas, because he has been initiated (ὅτι μεμύηται)."[8] To some Athenians who urged him to be initiated he is said to have made a similar rejoinder: "It would be ridiculous to suppose that Agesilaus and Epaminondas are to dwell in the mud while worthless individuals are to be in the isles of the blest because they have been initiated."[9] Of the Valentinians Irenæus wrote: "But as to themselves, they hold that they shall be entirely and undoubtedly saved, not by means of conduct, but because they are spiritual by nature."[10]

At Eleusis the homicide was rejected, as was also the professor of unhallowed rites;[11] otherwise there seem to have been no definite moral demands laid upon the candidates. They were not redeemed from any sinful ways. No pattern of conduct was held up before them.[12] Even in the case of Orphism, where moral earnestness is often stressed, F. Legge[13] maintains that the prominence of the moral factors has been over-emphasized. It is fair, I think, to say that originally there was nothing moral about the mysteries—Greek or Oriental—but that they gradually began to reflect the secular morality.[14] In the case of the Oriental cults this is not to be seen before the second century of our era; in the Greek mysteries this dawning moral consciousness is to be seen, although only dimly, by the fourth century B.C.

---

[6] Sophocles, *Fgm.* 753.

[7] Cf. Lietzmann, *Handb. z. N. T.*, *I Kor.*, pp. 46 ff.

[8] Plutarch, *Quomodo adulescens poetas audire debeat* 4, p. 21F. This point is stressed by Rohde, *Psyche* $^{5, 6}$ i, pp. 298 ff., 307 ff., 312; ii, pp. 71 ff.

[9] Diogenes Laertius vi, 39.

[10] Iren., *Adv. Haer.* i, 6, 2.

[11] Philostratus iv, 18—p. 72.

An early and striking instance of this dawning moral element is seen when the chorus of mystæ sing in the *Frogs* of Aristophanes:

> For we alone have a sun and a holy light, we who were initiated *and who live toward friends and strangers with reverence towards the gods.*[15]

Many Christian apologists have overlooked the nobler elements in these cults and have laid too much stress upon the magical efficacy of the initiatory rites. We might logically expect that since salvation depended on rites rather than upon the conduct, and that, since no attention was paid to morals, thereby immorality would have been fostered, but this should not be unduly stressed. Indeed, from Paul's emphasis on salvation through faith in Christ we might have expected him to have neglected the moral element, but II Cor. 5:10 reveals that moral integrity ofttimes surpasses logic.

---

[12] J. E. Carpenter, *Phases of Early Christianity*, p. 217.

[13] *Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity*, i, pp. 146 f. For a recent and able article "Orphism and Paulinism," by the Italian scholar Macchioro, see the *Journal of Religion*, July, 1928, pp. 337–370; also his book *Zagreus*.

[14] For example, Lucian's Demonax refused to be initiated because, were the mysteries bad, he would not remain silent to those not yet initiated, but would seek to deter them; if they were beneficial, he would feel it his bounden duty to proclaim them to all.—*Vit. Demon.* 11, p. 380.

[15] *Ranes* 454 ff.

It cannot be denied that the orgiastic nature of the celebrations often led to extravagances that might well have shocked conventional Rome. In the worship of Attis, who became the outstanding figure in religion, putting even Magna Mater herself into the background,[16] there was the frenzied mourning, the flagellation, the slashing of arms, and even self-mutilation by the aspirants for the priesthood; while on the succeeding day (Mar. 25) the *Hilaria* took place in which the frenzied mourning was turned into equal excesses of rejoicing, and with feasting, masquerade, and unrestrained ribaldry the resurrection of Attis was celebrated.[17] But while perhaps this is to be charged against the religion, it apparently was not a part of the ritual and was probably obnoxious to many of the devotees. An instructive modern parallel may be seen in the antics that often follow the "camp-meeting" in the remoter districts of America, where those who had been content an hour before to be "brothers and sisters in the Lord" find new relationships helpful as a means of recovering normalcy.

The worship of Isis has received a great deal of criticism for the alleged obscenity of her rites, but the objectionable elements were due apparently to abuses resulting from acts of outsiders and from the dissoluteness of individual priests, rather than from anything inherently vicious in the ceremonies or obligations. The poets frequently represent that many of her women devotees were of easy virtue and that her temples were frequented by youths in search of gallant adventures. To be sure, Ovid[18] recommends them for that purpose *along with the Jewish synagogues*; the story of Paulina recounted by Josephus[19] is familiar to all. Yet on the other hand the elegiac lovers complain that the chaste days of Isis thwart their desires.[20] Evidence such as this should be treated with great care.[21] The one passage that we have that describes the initiatory rites[22] would seem to indicate that, far from being degrading, they were of quite different nature. Yet it must be observed that the hero's life as depicted in the earlier ten books was not striking for its self-restraint. This will illustrate the fact that while the mysteries did not normally demand or even consider moral purity, yet they did not as a general thing put a premium on the reverse.

---

[16] G. F. Moore, *Hist. Rel.*, i, p. 581.

[17] *Ibid.*

The hierodouloi, or temple prostitutes,[23] are often referred to as evidences of the immoral rites connected with this type of worship. But here, too, we need be cautious. There is a great danger in massing all the mysteries—Greek and Oriental together—and then in picking out various striking abuses, which may often be isolated or exceptional, and in using them indiscriminately of all the cults. The Gilgamesh epic refers to female hierodouloi in the worship of Ishtar, particularly at Erech. In the code of Hammurabi they are taken for granted and receive certain rights and privileges. In Syria they played a part in the cult of Attar.[24] Herodotus[25] in whom we find combined the historian and preserver of strange and recondite material, relates that in Babylonia every woman once in her life was required to sit in the temple of fertility until some stranger came and threw a piece of silver into her lap with the word, "I beseech Mylitta to favor thee." The woman then lay with him outside the temple precinct and, having thus fulfilled her obligation to the goddess, returned home. This experience involved no disgrace, but on the contrary was considered highly to her credit. At Paphos on the island of Cyprus a similar demand obliged all women to offer themselves in prostitution before marriage.[26] Lucian[27] notes that in Byblos in Phœnicia in connection with the worship of Adonis, or Tammuz, women were compelled to prostitute themselves for a day or to offer their hair as a sacrifice. It is by no means improbable that down to the time of Josiah hierodouloi, both male and female, were attached to the temple of Jehovah. Grouped together this may make a quite black picture, but when it is remembered that these examples were taken from the various cults and during a period of many centuries, it would seem to indicate that the cults were not nearly so much honeycombed by this abuse as is sometimes suggested. Indeed, as we shall see in the discussion of celibacy,[28] some authors maintain that in the worship of Isis her devotees were celibate. Farnell [29] declares that the records of the worship of Aphrodite—a cult synonymous in many writings with sexual excesses—show it to have been of the purest nature in olden times and the only hint of impurity to have been in Corinth.

---

[18] *Ars Amat.* i, 75 ff. Propertius (*Eleg.* ii, 19, 10) berates the temple as one of the chief causes of his Cynthia's faithlessness.

[19] *Antt.* 18, 3, 4.

[20] Propert., *Eleg.* ii, 33; iv, 5, 34.

[21] Cf. G. F. Moore, *op. cit.*, i, p. 587; Friedländer, *Sittengeschichte Roms*[9] (1919), i, p. 302.

[22] Apuleius, *Met.* xi.

[23] See especially *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, vi, pp. 672 ff., art. "Hierodouloi—Semitic and Egyptian" (G. A. Barton).

---

[24] Ephrem Syr., *Opera* 459 C. This passage is quoted in full by G. A. Barton, art. "The Semitic Ishtar Cult," *Hebraica*, x, p. 58.

[25] *Hist.* i, 199; cf. Strabo, *Geogr.* xvi, 1, 20.

[26] Herod. i, 199; Clement Alex., *Cohortatio ad Gentes* 2, Migne 8, p. 75B; Athenæus, *Deipn.* xii, 11, p. 516 a.

[27] *de Syria Dea* 6, p. 454.

In this brief survey of the ethical equipment of the mystery cults I have tried to indicate that they were entirely unconcerned with what has come to be felt indissolubly linked to all true religion—morality. As Cumont remarked, the entire system of ethical values was overturned. The goal to be achieved was not a life conformable to nature or to the dictates of reason, as for the Stoics; nor was the ideal to make one's life as near as possible to that of God, as for the Jew. The goal was moved from the realm of this age to that of the future. So Cicero might say, "In the mysteries we learn not only to live happily but to die with fairer hope."[30] The achievement no longer depended on the probity of the individual. Yet that did not mean that because of this

[28] Pp. 185 f.

[29] *The Cults of the Greek States*, ii, p. 663; cf. G. F. Moore, *op. cit.*, i, p. 422.

[30] *de Legibus* ii, 14.

the devotees went to excesses that they otherwise would not have reached. In short, the cults were unconcerned with moral standards; they neither accepted nor rejected. If a person were already virtuous, the cult would probably not corrupt him; if he were not virtuous, it would not tend to make him so. In the *Bacchæ* of Euripides the prophet with lofty unconcern retorts to Pentheus, "Dionysos does not constrain women to be chaste";[31] yet two lines further on it is said, "Even in the Bacchic orgy the virtuous woman will not be corrupted."[32] That crude and repulsive legends were connected with every one of the pagan mysteries and could only be explained away for the cultivated devotee by some rationalistic effort or by a violent exercise of faith is true. That the rites in some of the cults at least were orgiastic and tended to produce emotional extravagance and breaches of the mores when both sexes were thrown into intimate relations, as was the case save in Mithraism, where women apparently were never accepted as candidates,[33] cannot be denied. In fact, there are occasional hints in Paul's writings that suggest that he feared precisely this for his converts. But that this was not the rule, that it was not a part of the ritual, but extravagance growing out of it seems almost certain. While there is little reason to think that those who claimed salvation through Isis or Magna Mater were much better than their neighbors, there seems as little reason to think they were any worse. The cult of Isis, for example, did not force itself upon the world through any lofty moral precepts. The virtue it enjoined would not compare with the precepts of the Stoics. This, however, should not obscure the fact that it marked a higher stage, offered a greater beauty of ritual, and actually made possible a far superior morality than had the ancient creeds.

---

[31] *Bacchæ* 314.

[32] *Ibid.* 316.

[33] G. F. Moore, *op. cit.*, i, p. 599; Cumont, *Die Mysterien des Mithra*, p. 163.

It must also be remembered that the members of all these cults were living in the world. Though they might belong to this cult or that, they were not cut off from their fellow men. They mingled in the market place; they heard the Stoics and other moralists preaching. The result was that while the cults themselves had nothing to induce either morality or immorality from within, yet they gradually began to reflect the external secular morality, and, as history attests, actually these Oriental cults did contribute to the higher moral and spiritual life of the Roman Empire during the second, third, and fourth Christian centuries.[34] This had not taken place to any extent apparently by the time of Paul, yet in the Greek cults a similar state had been reached several centuries earlier, not produced by the cults themselves, but induced by the better type of worshipers, who reflected contemporary standards. There seems every reason to believe that to many members of the cults—both Greek and Oriental—the accompanying obscenities must have been highly objectionable, and that a reliance upon salvation through the rites would not have excluded the desire for personal probity. It is fallacious in the extreme to feel that the only men who experience moral sentiments in an age other than our own are the ones that have left written documents behind them. Plato and Seneca and Paul were not unique. They expressed in concentrated form what many of the rank and file believed. Otherwise their influence would have been little and their writings would never have survived.

---

[34] So C. H. Moore, *op. cit.*, pp. 292 ff.

Such were the mysteries at the time of Paul: entirely unconcerned with questions of ethics—salvation came through proper rites, not proper conduct—yet not inciting a disregard for morality nor making obscenity attractive; slowly acquiring what we have termed a "secular morality," due in part to outside influences, in part to the demands of those devotees who could not be satisfied with mere ceremonial assurance;[35] allegorizing or interpreting away the repulsive legends, finally becoming a positive force for moral uplift in later centuries. This phenomenon, which may seem self-contradictory, must not be disregarded.

The question at once arises: What would be Paul's attitude to them? Apparently he felt them to be instituted by demons and hateful to God. This convenient method of disposing of views and practices akin to those of the Christians was in high repute in the early church as Justin Martyr evidences.[36] Yet while that was the conscious attitude of his mind, Paul was a man, as we have seen, who drew unconsciously from many sources. While these hateful and dangerous cults were to be shunned by Christians—"Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of demons; ye cannot partake of the table of the Lord, and of the table of demons,"[37] the needs they ministered to, though mistakenly, were real needs. As a result, although he would not borrow from them, at least consciously, his preaching was directed to supply just these wants. We shall have to consider some of the points of resemblance more fully in the treatment of Paul's ethics. Suffice it to say here that the problem of presenting a Jewish "Messiah" to a Greek world compelled Paul to do considerable adapting. To illustrate by one point alone. What was he to call Jesus? Plainly *Christ* (χριστός) would not suffice. This to a Greek would mean merely "the one smeared with medicated oil," for oil was not used by them for honorific purposes, but for the relief of pain. Accordingly, we find *Christ* fast becoming a part of the proper name (Jesus Christ or Christ Jesus) and not a title; its place was supplied by the title *Lord* (κύριος). This is not the place to consider whether Paul took this name from the Septuagint or from every-day speech, or, indeed, whether he invented it himself. Paul has not told us, and so speculation, while free, is rather fruitless. One thing is certain. Whatever Paul meant by it, it would signify just one thing to his non-Jewish hearers—namely, that Jesus was a redeemer-god, even as were the lords of the other cults. Whether or not Paul intended them to think this is one question; that they did seems clear. Accordingly, by this one fact alone the Christianity which Paul preached was made to seem like the cults even though the latter may well have been repugnant to him. It can be safely said that Paul does not show the slightest resemblance to or dependence upon the mystery cults for moral exhortations—and from their unmoral nature we could only expect this. To some that fact might logically exclude all mention of them in a treatment of Paul's ethics. But this discussion has seemed necessary, since Paul again and again phrased his ethical ideals and goals in terms precisely similar to the other mysteries. For him Christianity was a mystery. It had its initiatory rite and sacramental meal. Jesus was its Lord. Salvation came to the initiate through union with him. So far akin. But the contrast is as sharp as the agreement. Paul was a Jew, and of the strictest morality. The logical implication of freedom from the Mosaic law, of the sufficiency of faith and baptism, never caused him to lose his heritage of moral standards. The Christian might become ἅγιος[38] —and did by baptism—but a life of sin would bring its sure and swift retribution. This was a flaw in logic, but a glorious one. Again, Paul was the uncompromising monotheist. For him Christianity could never stand one among many. Isis might prefer to be called Queen Isis, yet she was tolerant to those who knew her by other names;[39] for Paul Jesus must stand alone and be recognized by all, for God had highly exalted him, and had given unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.[40]

---

[35] Cf. Rohde, *Psyche* ^{5,6}, i, pp. 313 f.

[36] *Apol.* i, 54–60, 62, 66; cf. Tertullian, *de Praescript. Haer.* 40.

---

[37] I Cor. 10:21; see further pp. 140 ff.

---

[38] For a discussion of this epithet see p. 64, n. 2.

[39] Cf. Apuleius, *Met.* xi, 5.

---

[40] Phil. 2:9 ff.

PART II
The Ethics of Paul
SECTION I
Ethical Principles

Chapter IV—The Central Place of Morality in the Life and Thought of Paul

BY FAITH in Christ and the power of his resurrection the Christian came into immediate fellowship with his Lord. He was baptized into his death and, thus leaving behind his old sinful nature, was raised into newness of life. He had died to the flesh, characterized and dominated by all its lusts, and henceforth lived to the spirit. Thus he actually became a new man in Christ Jesus. He had been consecrated, set apart, by baptism, but this rite, though important, did not have the same magical effectiveness as did the similar initiatory rites of the other cults. In them it was sufficient. By this initiation into the cult the devotee learned "the secret" by the aid of "the things done and the things said;" accordingly, salvation was unconditionally assured him. The Christian rite was to a measure similar in that it too plunged the initiate into mystic union with the risen Lord, by the impartation of whose spirit a new life began, yet that was not all. His life must conform to his new exalted status of being "in Christ" (ἐν Χριστῷ) *i.e.*, mystically and intimately united with Christ. By this union he was assured a place in the eternal destiny of the world, in the new age soon to be ushered in. Death, should that come before the dawn of the new age, would have no effect save that of bringing the

RITE O
BAPTIS

Christian into an even closer union freed from any danger of relapse into sin.

But this glorious destiny was only for those who actually lived "in Christ." To be sure, good works as such, keeping of the law and the like, could not grant this boon; it must come as the free gift of God to be appropriated by the Christian's faith, yet this faith was by no means a mere intellectual assent. As Matthew Arnold neatly turned it:

> The surpassing religious grandeur of Paul's conception of faith is that it seizes a real salutary emotional force of incalculable magnitude, and reinforces moral effort with it.[1]

It was actually a new life where the flesh was in subjection to the spirit and brought forth fruits evidencing the fact that the man was righteous before God. For Paul, morality, far from being of no consequence as we have seen it was for the other mysteries, was directly resultant from his doctrine of salvation through faith. The Christian was impelled toward a certain kind of life by virtue of his union with his Lord. If he was really ἅγιος[2]—consecrated, separate, set apart to God—to

---

[1] *St. Paul and Protestantism*, (1888), p. 53.

[2] The fundamental concept is "rendered or declared holy"—*i.e.*, set apart to God—and so refers to a religious status rather than being a moral characterization. So ὁ ἅγιος was not necessarily a perfect man—though Paul would say he ought also to be—but one in religious connection with God. Some argue that in Rom. 12:1 (cf. Sanday, *ICC* in loc. and on 1:7) ἁγίαν is used of moral purity, and cite I Pet. 1:16 and Lev. 19:2 as evidence for its use in such a sense. But it should be noted that in I Pet. 1:16 the author is quoting the LXX rather than choosing ἅγιος for what it independently would have conveyed, and that the emphasis is not on being ἅγιος, but on imitating God. For Paul ἅγιος does not seem to have this moral sense; the latter appears to have come later, and may very possibly have been due to the Jewish strain in early Christianity and the use of ἅγιος, to translate קדש which latter had come to have a moral content (v. p. 5).

Paul's mind he must inevitably show it; if he was really yoked to Christ, he must live in a fitting way. The exalted position he held as actually "in his Lord," and with his Lord dwelling in him,[3] could not fail to bring him to the full stature of the perfect man. As a recent writer has expressed it:

> . . . In Christianity a character conformed to God's own is the consequence of the grace of God in Jesus Christ, through the Holy Spirit. The possession of such a character is therefore the criterion of the genuineness of man's faith and the reality of his union with Christ.[4]

This was the gospel which he had been called to preach. It was at once his duty and his joy to make it known to all men. He was not ashamed of it, for it was the power of God to salvation to all who accepted it. His task was to strive in every possible way to offer this gospel to men that they would accept it; that he might present all men faultless in Christ Jesus; that at the great day of judgment, when all men stood before the judgment bar,[5] it might be not a day of wrath,[6] but a day of salvation.[7] To attain this he would go to all extremes. Though free through the power of Christ's death, he gladly made himself a slave to all that he might win all for Christ. Though a free man, he rejoiced that he was privileged to be Christ's slave in this glorious task. Nothing else in life counted; the most prized possessions of life—high birth, a noble ancestry, a rich heritage—of which he had been proud, he now gladly reckoned as less then nothing. In comparison with this one great hope of being found in Christ, and through a life of participation in Christ's sufferings of attaining to the resurrection of his Lord, they were but refuse and offscouring.[8]

---

[3] These phrases of Paul, "in Christ" and "Christ liveth in me," are not to be understood as figures of speech. Paul meant them to be understood literally. Christ actually entered the man, set him free, brought him from death to life. As a result of this union he was in Christ and in a position to share his death and resurrection. Cf. Rom. 6:4; 8:10; Gal. 1:16; 2:20; 3:27; 4:19; Phil. 3:7–11.

[4] G. F. Moore, *Birth and Growth of Religion*, p. 176.

[5] Rom. 14:10; II Cor. 5:10.

[6] Rom. 2:5.

[7] II Cor. 6:2.

This was the heritage in store for every Christian. The prize, beside which all else was worthless, was the call to this glorious fellowship which came from God through Christ Jesus.[9] The way might be rough; the Christian life which must be resolutely achieved might be accompanied by suffering; temptations would come—but never beyond their strength;[10] false teachers would strive to deceive; the lusts of the flesh would menace; but all these must be crushed. The struggle would be desperately hard, but the goal would be worth it. Nor must they wait too long. Even then the day was at hand. For those who failed it would be a day of wrath and condemnation; but to those who were in Christ, and whose lives proved it, it would be a day of praise and honor, and, better than that, of eternal life in their Lord. Thus the first demand upon the Christian was, as an individual, to make his life conform to that of his Lord; to cut himself free resolutely from all that would

[8] Phil. 3:4 ff.

[9] Phil. 3:14.

[10] I Cor. 10:13.

hinder and impede. Its character was purity, separateness; its motive, the hope of eternal salvation.

To us today Paul's emphasis on morality and his insistence that actual union with Christ must result in a changed life seem perfectly normal. Yet it must never be overlooked that that would not have been the consensus of opinion in his own day. As we have had occasion to notice already, the Oriental mystery cults made no such demands on their devotees; correctness of ritual, not purity of life, was the essential requirement. Moreover, religion and ethics in the ancient world were not so nearly identified as we are wont to make them today.

This makes Paul's insistence on the changed life which bears fruits of the spirit the more noteworthy, for one might expect from a saying like, "But if it is by grace, it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace,"[11] where faith and works are set in contrast, that Paul would have entirely disregarded conduct and would have disagreed utterly with James. Here Paul and James, however, are on entirely different ground. It is an error to feel that one has a broader view than the other, for they are not discussing the same matter. James is arguing that both faith and works are necessary; Paul, on the contrary, although setting fully as high an ethical standard, denies that salvation comes through works, but insists that the works evidence the fact that the individual has actually entered into union with Christ. Paul would not have quarreled with James'

[11] Rom. 11:6.

contentions about morality or the need of works, although he would probably have preferred to call the latter "fruits of the spirit." The important fact, too often overlooked, is that what Paul stigmatized "works of the law" are by no means the same as the works which James demands, while the sort of faith which James calls "dead" would never have been classed as faith at all by Paul.

The significant point for us is not to strive to defend Paul's logic—always a difficult undertaking—but to recognize how fundamental to all his thinking was the emphasis on moral probity. Well did he realize the danger of his emphasis on freedom from law. The *pneumatikoi* at Corinth were evidencing the results that might well come from such a teaching when detached from moral requirements. Accordingly, again and again he asserts that such conduct clearly revealed the fact that the faith professed is not in Christ, but in the power of wickedness, and warns that all men regardless of baptism must stand before the judgment bar.[12]

The question arises why Paul laid the stress he did on moral conduct. There is a tendency today to see a Stoic influence at work in the apostle. There is no question but what the Stoic moral requirements were strict in Paul's time, and that he would have approved them,

[12] Rom. 14:10; II Cor. 5:10. I Cor. 3:13 would seem to give some justification for considering that Paul felt that though all would be searched and proved, and that the one whose works failed the test would suffer a serious loss, yet he would be saved ultimately. On the one hand, faith must be a new life; fruits of the spirit must be shown. Baptism and being ἅγιος were not enough. On the other hand, the man brought into union with Christ, even though he grievously fails, has been baptized and will be saved. The two cannot be reconciled. See also pp. 58, 153.

but I see no reason for assuming influence where the evidence is completely lacking. Paul's heritage from Judaism and his view of Jesus are sufficient to explain his attitude.

In Judaism, as was emphasized in Chapter I, religion and morals were essentially identified, and the highest of standards for conduct set. God had revealed his will in requirements of conduct as in everything else. Israel was to follow it. Here an important point is to be noticed. The fundamental requirement was conformity to God. "Be ye holy, for I am holy." Jehovah was a God of unstained character; no impure myths or legends told of his amours. He was a God of righteousness and of holiness; and holiness—at least in the days of Judaism—signified moral purity. Accordingly, the people must reflect this character in their lives.

Paul held this view of God. This moral outlook on life was bred in the bone. So when he came to his view of the mystical union of the believer with Christ—which actually lay at the bottom of all his thinking—it was but natural that the same strict moral requirements should be made. Christ was no unmoral or immoral deity, as were the lords in some of the other cults. None of the amours or impure stories that were told of all the pagan deities were told of him. His character was of the same spotless purity as was that of Jehovah. As a result requirements of character, which were neglected or unnoticed by the ministrants of the Oriental mystery cults, were of prime importance to

Paul. Such was the Lord to whom Christians were most intimately united, who dwelt in them, and to whom they were set apart from all that would defile. Anything that would tend to sully Christ, to join him to a harlot, to defile the body which was his holy temple, was an abomination and to be shunned resolutely.

The historian is always subject to the danger of attempting to find the complete explanation of a man in his environment and heredity, and thus to neglect the personal element. In none is this more unfortunate than in Paul. He was a debtor both to Jew and to Greek, but that does not explain him. His own personality and individual contribution cannot be neglected. This is particularly true in his moral teachings. Here Paul was reflecting his own outlook on life. He could well admonish his churches to become imitators of him. His standards were of the highest. He has often been charged with being a casuist and opportunist, but the criticism neglects the essential fact that Paul's opportunism was never for his own advantage. He might be all things to all people, but his purpose was to win them for God.

Phil. 1:15–18 is instructive. Apparently some Christians[13] who were jealous of Paul had been striving to undermine his influence at Philippi and had made false charges against him, yet Paul refuses to yield to any personal animosity, but rather rejoices in so far as they preach Christ, in spite of their attack on him. This is one of the brightest spots in Paul's writings. No bidding for flattery here. This reveals the sincerity and disinterested nature of the apostle's work. Even in the words, "I would that they that unsettle you would even go beyond circumcision (ἀποκόψονται),"[14] which Sanday characterized as "one of the very few flaws in a truly noble and generous character," it is not personal animosity that leads the apostle to speak in such bitterness. His opponents are poaching on his preserves, but the terrible thing to Paul is that, owing to their selfishness and desire for personal gain, they are striving to nullify Christ's death and to plunge the Galatian Christians back into hopeless servitude to the law of sin and death. Paul's words are bitter, but the bitterness does not come from personal grudge.[15] Or again in the delightful little letter

---

[13] Vincent (*ICC Phil.* in loc.) adopts this interpretation of the opponents, and summarizes the arguments of those who understand them to be Judaizers. Indeed, the Judaizers seem to be falling on bad days. In a penetrating essay, "The Epistle to the Romans and Jewish Christianity" (*Studies in Early Christianity*, edited by S. J. Case, pp. 353–365), James Hardy Ropes fails to find a trace of them west of Galatia, while Donald W. Riddle, "The So-called Jewish Christians" (*Anglican Theological Review*, July, 1929, pp. 15–33) concludes "that the common appeal to Jewish Christians to account for certain phenomena in early Christian history and literature is too largely fanciful."

And now in a recent monograph, *The Singular Problem of the Epistle to the Galatians* (*Harvard Theological Studies* xiv, 1929), Professor Ropes challenges the universally held view that the Judaizers were the sole cause of Paul's difficulty in Galatia.

[14] Gal. 5:12.

[15] Much critical ingenuity has been expended on this passage. Some see in it a reference to the emasculation of the priests of Cybele; others see a tacit reference to Deut. 23:1, "He that is wounded in the stones, or hath his privy member cut off shall not enter into the assembly of Jehovah," thus signifying that he desired them to be rendered liable to expulsion from the congregation of the Lord. Burton (*ICC Gal.* in loc.), who thinks it is not improbable that Paul had this passage in mind, admits that "he could hardly have expected his Galatian readers to think of it." But all this seems forced. Apparently Paul, writing in the heat of passion, is not thinking of any Jewish

to Philemon, which seems genuine if any of the letters are to be attributed to Paul, once more he shows his ethical soundness. Gladly would he have kept Onesimus to help him, yet he sent him back to make restitution.

In the course of the more detailed examination of Paul's particular precepts and admonitions we shall have occasion to consider his motives and arguments in fuller detail; but it has seemed wise in this discussion of his emphasis on morality and high standards of life, in an age when many teachers were completely silent on the subject, to stress the fact that, while his Jewish heritage explains why a high morality *might have been natural* to him, as a matter of fact it *was*, and that it seemed to him, far from constituting any artificial or unreasonable service—what gentleman does?—to be the normal result of a life lived in Christ.

But Paul was a practical man, and he realized well that this was a practical world. Though the Christian was united with his Lord, he was also in the closest contact with his fellows. They had had similar experiences; they were joined in the same vital union—or should be—with their risen Lord; their tasks were much the same. Accordingly, they should live in the most perfect harmony, and by a mutual give-and-take strengthen each other in their glorious faith. Paul loves to emphasize the "solidarity" of man, the joint interest

---

law of exclusion, but means, "Mutilating themselves? Yes, I wish they would go a little further and do a little effective mutilating." Meyer (in loc.) sees in it a "strong and bitterly sarcastic note of holy indignation," and remarks, "The wish, if earnestly meant, would be a silly one."

which binding humanity together makes the brother's interest truly one's own.

Here Paul made his most lasting contribution. The Stoics had urged a noble life, a resolute uprooting of all passions and appetites, a purging of the life from all excesses and lusts of the flesh, a daily self-examination and gradual improvement. But they failed to provide a goal attractive to the many. Comparatively few cared to accept the rigorous self-discipline with no goal save doing it because it was right. Weariness in well-doing was the great obstacle. There was no future reward held out to them, nor was there the challenging social call to do it for the sake of one's fellow citizen.

Paul met both these longings. Like the mystery cults, Christianity promised future life where all transient sufferings and sorrows would be forgotten in the glorious estate reserved for them. And Christianity was free from the extravagance and obscenities that so often marred the other mysteries and had to be explained or allegorized away. But in addition to this goal or reward which served as a tremendous motive Paul gave Christianity a lasting solidarity by his emphasis on their obligation one to the other. Not only was a man to strive to walk worthily of the inheritance that was to be his, and by his purity of life to show he was a "new man," but he was to live and act in such a way that his brethren might also attain. They were a little band of people, sojourners in a foreign land; heaven was their home. They were exposed to dangers from both Jew and heathen. False brethren were striving to spy out their freedom, to bring them again into captivity to sin. They must offer an unbroken front to the enemy.

Nor was this the only reason for their union. Aside from the danger from without that united them, the Christians were to live together as brethren; their faith was in a common Lord—one Lord, one faith, one baptism.[16] Dissension and discord among themselves was a sin against Christ, for by the particular nature of their bond with him they were linked together. As Christ dwelt in them, they together actually formed his body, various members surely, but yet together actually making up the body. Lack of harmony, factiousness, and the like would disrupt Christ's body; so the sin of the one was against the many. Actually this consciousness of the corporate life, of the unity of believers, was the most effective motive that Paul could have urged upon his fellow Christians for achieving the true *koinonia.*

Love and forbearance were the great social virtues. Love that united all in the common bond, that saw in his neighbor's good his own—this was the social virtue *par excellence.* It stood the fulfillment of all law.[17] But complementing it was forbearance. If the Christian groups were to be in harmony and in peace—and God had called them to peace[18]—they must show forbearance each to the other. As each had received special gifts from God, he was to use them, but was to remember that the really great gifts were those that ministered to the edification of all. All had not reached the

[16] Eph. 4:5.

[17] Rom. 13:8–10; Gal. 5:14.

[18] I Cor. 7:15; cf. also Rom. 14:19.

same stage of moral maturity. Those who were strong must never misuse their freedom; they were to bear the burdens of the weak,[19] lest the weaker brother perish—a brother for whose sake Christ had died.[20] On the contrary, it is to be observed that the weaker brother is not to relapse into self-complacency on account of his scruples and to assume a self-righteous judgment toward those who have more common sense. "Let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth; for God hath received him."[21] As love was the all-enduring virtue and forbearance was its corollary, service was the great duty. Each man was to help the other; service was the law of life. They had been called to freedom—not, however, to a freedom that was license, but where love found its expression in service.[22]

In such a group arrogance and pride would be out of place. They were not their own, but were bought with a price. Each was to walk preferring his neighbor to himself and in obedience to those in spiritual authority over them. Thus the purity and uprightness, the strictness and temperance of life that was demanded of the individual Christian as such from his relation to Christ flowered out into the social virtues and duties, due to the fact that all were members one of another, making up the body of which Christ was the head.

But though the Christians were thus united through their Lord one to another, they were living in a hostile

[19] Rom. 15:1.
[20] I Cor. 8:11.
[21] Rom. 14:1–23.
[22] Gal. 5:13.

world. Accordingly, questions arose as to what should be the relation of the individual Christian and of the Christian fellowship with the world. Paul's teaching was explicit. To the government and those in authority over them they were to be in the most lawful obedience,[23] for the powers that be were ordained of God. To the members of the world, discreet; all fellowship with them was not forbidden, indeed could not be. Christians lived in the world, although they were not of the world.[24] They were to be ever conscious, however, of the difference between themselves and those about. If the Christian was the slave of a heathen master, he was to serve him in the most perfect fidelity. If a Christian was married to an "unbeliever," the Christian was not to seek to break the alliance unless the unbeliever so desired. But he was not to make new alliances of this sort. So far as possible he was to remain unfettered. The attitude seems to be expressed by the warning: Be discreet, avoiding everything that would subject the Christian fellowship to attack or defame. Various questions presented themselves and received special attention, as we shall see, yet this seems to have been the general principle underlying the apostle's advice.

Thus we see Paul had no formal system of ethics as such, no text book for Christian conduct though the *Haustafeln* in the epistles to the Colossians[25] and Ephesians[26] would seem to be a step toward filling that

[23] Rom. 13:1–7.
[24] I Cor. 5:9–13.
[25] 3:18–4:1.
[26] 5:22–6:9.

need.[27] Ethics and religion for him, as for any other Jew, could never be dissociated. The Christian ethic was the living in a manner worthy of the high calling to which the Christian had been called. It embraced the whole of life and all the relationships of life. While occasional questions would arise as to the proper course to be followed with the fellow Christian and with the group as such or with "unbelievers," yet the real answer was implicit in the Christian's proper conduct of life as such. Accordingly, all these distinctions which to a degree are necessary for a modern consideration are not completely happy, and must never be regarded as hard and fast. All the duties and virtues, the responsibilities and privileges, were included in the task the Christian had of living in a way worthy of his calling, and were inspired by the longing to attain to his promised reward.

In conclusion, throughout his epistles the ethical note is prominent. The theological or doctrinal discussions may engage him for the moment, yet he ever turns back as Gardner[28] acutely observes "with obvious relief . . . to his ethical exhortation." These exhortations for the most part were called forth to meet the specific needs of the Christians to whom he ministered, and thus were intensely practical and timely in their nature and a far step from the ordered sequence of a Greek moralist like Aristotle. Yet they were not the impromptu words of an opportunist, but were the expression of the deep-seated principles governing his life—of the facts and implicates of union with Christ, and their corollary, the union of fellow believers in Christ. We might almost say this sense of *koinonia* produced his ethics, or at least gave to it its distinctive form. How this for Paul was the real criterion for Christian conduct we shall have to consider in a later chapter.

---

[27] The Pastorals show the next step, while a passage like Clem. Alex., *Paed.* iii, 11 ff. serves as a handbook of Christian conduct, discussing the question of proper clothing, the propriety of wearing earrings, finger rings, the use of cosmetics, how to walk decorously, of amusements, even attempting the description of the model maiden—what she should do and what not.

[28] *The Religious Experience of St. Paul*, p. 139.

PART II

The Ethics of Paul

SECTION I

Ethical Principles

THE STANDARDS – CRITERIA OF CONDUCT

Chapter V—Standards—The Answer of Judaism

HAVING seen the emphasis Paul laid on a strict morality, we are at once confronted with the question: What was to be the criterion for conduct? What was to serve as the standard for judging whether an act was right or wrong, a life worthy or unworthy? For Paul would have been in complete disagreement with the "suspension of judgment" (ἐποχή)[1] of Scepticism, illustrated by the saying of Sextus Empiricus, "Nothing of itself is either good or ill."[2] How was the Christian to know whether an act was right or wrong? What was the criterion by which Paul himself would approve or disapprove? To be sure, it was to fulfill God's will,[3] but how was that will to be known?

For the Jew this would not have constituted any problem at all. The Torah was the complete revelation of God. Everything that was necessary for man to know was here provided. All he needed to do was to follow its prescriptions and he would perform God's will. It was all equally ancient and authoritative. It had all been created by God before the creation of the world. To be sure, many of the detailed prescriptions were uttered by priests and lawyers many years after Sinai, but they were not originating anything new. They were merely repeating what God had announced to Moses on Sinai.

---

[1] A word which never occurs in the Pauline writings, although a common term in contemporary ethics, defined by Cicero (*Acad.* ii, 18, 59) as *adsensionis retentio* and which Epictetus (1, 4, 11) contrasted with πρόσθεσις.

[2] xi, 140, p. 716—οὔτε ἀγαθόν τι ἐστι φύσει οὔτε κακόν.

[3] Cf. Rom. 12:2.

Some of the laws had been given to Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Jacob.

> In rabbinical circles the question was raised whether the laws given to Israel by Moses had not been known to the Patriarchs—does it not say that the law which Moses gave was an "inheritance of the congregation of Jacob," coming to them, that is, from the Fathers (Deut. 33:4; Sifrè Deut. § 345)? Abraham, in particular, it was said, was thoroughly versed in both the written and the unwritten law, and kept them both. He followed all the commandments most scrupulously; even the *'erub tabshilin* was observed in his household.[4]

Indeed, as a matter of fact, all had actually heard the law when it was first given, for "all souls, even those which still had to be created, were present at the revelation on Mt. Sinai."[5] As we have seen, it was through following the direction of the Torah that man could realize what was at once his highest duty and greatest privilege, being like God.

We have seen good reason to believe that in spite of Paul's break with Judaism and the ever-widening breach resulting from his conflicts with the Jews and Judaizers, Paul still remained in many respects a loyal Jew. The question at once arises, To what extent, if any, did the Torah remain for him a criterion? This is one of the most delicate questions with which the student of

---

[4] G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i, pp. 275 f.

[5] Exod. R. 28, 6.

Paul is confronted. Passages like Rom. 6:14; 7:4–6; 10:4; Gal. 2:19; 3:10 ff., 24 f.; 4:7; 5:21 ff., would tend to make us answer "to no extent." And to a measured degree this is correct. "Christ is the end of the law unto righteousness to every one that believeth."[6] In Galatians, written in the heat of controversy, Paul goes rather further in his condemnation and attack upon the law than he does in his more studied epistle to the Romans. Gal. 3:10-14 is particularly instructive. Quoting Deut. 27:26, "Cursed is every one who continueth not in all things that are written in the book of the law, to do them," Paul argues that the Jews thus stand condemned, for theirs is a hopeless task. No one is able to keep the whole law, hence the curse and hopelessness of the law. But while the law cannot save, Christ has rescued us; accordingly, faith in him is effective, while obedience to the law is of no avail. We are sometimes misled by an improper interpretation of Gal. 3:24, "So that the law is become our tutor to bring us unto Christ," into thinking that the law was thus a preparatory stage to the gospel, and that it led men forward until they had reached the next and highest level. This misconstrues the whole matter and is due to an unwarranted use of the gentle art of derivation—always dangerous. Calling the law παιδαγωγός (and for this *tutor* is a singularly unhappy translation) was not intended by Paul as any compliment. Men were under a harsh and rough menial, and there was no way of escape.

In Rom. 7:7, following a careful exposition of his cardinal idea—justification by faith—Paul, fearing that he might be charged with antinomianism, for he well knew the excesses to which his dangerous doctrine of freedom might be pushed, wrote, "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid." The law was only the cause of sin, due to the weakness of the flesh. In itself it was holy (ἅγιος v. 12), and of God (v. 22). Indeed, it stood over against the flesh as spiritual (πνευματικός), while the natural man, whom Paul here refers to as "I," is carnal (σάρκινος v. 14).

---

[6] Rom. 10:4.

Galatians is quite different.[7] Here the law is referred to as thoroughly of this world. It was at best but a temporary affair from Moses to Christ. Because the law was 430 years later than the promise given to Abraham (which typified the new system in Christ and of which the Christians were the only legitimate heirs), it could not repudiate nor usurp the latter's place; nor was it the direct gift of God, but had been mediated through the angels and Moses.[8] In fact the law is described as being at least antagonistic to God's purpose if not actually in opposition to him.[9]

For Paul there were two systems in battle array: the old fleshly nature dominated by its passions and seeking to be justified before God by a punctilious keeping of the law to the letter; and the new man, united with—one might almost say, lost in—Christ, partaking of his nature, rescued by him from the curse of the law and thus rendered independent of its power, justified in the sight of God, as the other could never be, by the life he was living, which was faith in Christ. No man could hope for salvation by law observance. This whole attitude with its false system of values and its impossible demands he characterized as the *law*. Though it may appear to us that he was concerned especially with the ceremonial demands of the Mosaic law in Galatians and with the moral demands in Romans, yet to him it was a unit. The pseudo-scientific distinction that is sometimes made today between the ceremonial law and the moral law, and the statement that Paul broke with the one and held to the other, entirely miss the point.[10] No Jew ever made such a distinction. For Paul law was law; and when he broke with it he broke with it as a unit. The Christian was no longer under the constraint of the law in any of its aspects, moral or ceremonial. It was because of this complete emancipation that Paul was so constantly emphasizing that liberty was not license.

---

[7] 3:7–22.

[8] 3:19 f. Some commentators, as Caspari, Vogel, Ritschl, Kühl, understood Paul to mean that the angels were the actual lawgivers and Moses their mediator.

[9] So Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, p. 426.

Any adequate discussion of the question why Paul came to take such an attitude toward the law and by entirely neglecting a cardinal doctrine of Judaism, repentance, gave a picture of Judaism which has never been acceptable to any Jew would lead us far afield. It may be suggested, however, that his lifelong conflict with the Jews and the Judaizers probably explains a great deal, and that if we had some writing coming from his pen within a short time of his conversion we might well find that his attitude toward the law was quite different from that expressed in his extant epistles.[11] Be that as it may, it was just this freedom from the law that constituted for the Jew the greatest *skandalon*. Chrysostom acutely observes:

---

[10] So Ad. Zahn, *Das Gesetz Gottes nach der Lehre und der Erfahrung des Apostels Paulus* (1892), pp. 9 f. "Es ist für das Verständnis der Lehre Pauli vom Gesetz von der höchsten Wichtigkeit, dieses streng im Auge zu behalten, dass ihm das Gesetz ein Ganzes ist vom gleichwiegende Schwere und Bedeutung in allen seinen Teilen." Cf. also Juncker, *Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, i, p. 166; G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, ii, pp. 5 ff., 79.

> For even the cross which was a stumbling block to the Jews was not so much so as the failure to require obedience to the ancestral laws. For when they attacked Stephen they said not that he was worshipping the Crucified, but that he was speaking against the Law and the Holy Place.[12]

But in spite of Paul's break with the law and the bitter words he used of it in Galatians, owing to his belief that it was the law that was spurring his opponents on in their attempt to enslave again converts won to Christ, it must be remembered that Paul was a Jew, that as a young man he had been passionately devoted to the law, and that this antagonism to the law was, after all, acquired. Accordingly, its influence upon him, while now weakened, had left its indelible stamp. He could even refer to the new system as a law: "Where then is the glorying? It is excluded. By what manner of law? of works? Nay: but by a law of faith."[13] He could speak of himself as "under law to Christ,"[14] and could urge his followers to act in such a way as to "fulfil the law of Christ."[15]

---

[11] Clemen (*Die Chronologie der paulinische Briefe* 1893, and *Theol. Stud. Krit.*, 1897, pp. 219–270) maintained that in the writings of Paul we can see the gulf widening, that in the Thessalonian and Corinthian epistles he had taken a characteristically Jewish attitude, and that it was not until Galatians (written after the journey to Jerusalem described in Acts 21) that we find a real opposition to the law, and that this opposition to the law culminates in Philippians and Colossians. Of course, if, as seems probable, Galatians is the earliest of the extant epistles, the thesis is demolished at the start. Clemen himself later abandoned this view (*Theol. Lit.-Ztg.*, 1902). Sieffert (*Theologische Studien D. B. Weiss zu seinem* 70 *Geburtstag dargebracht*, 1897, pp. 332–357) sought to maintain precisely the opposite, namely, that we can see Paul's opposition to the law becoming less and less in his later writings. But this would demand that the epistles of the imprisonment show a much less opposition than do the earlier ones, which is hardly in line with the facts. As Juncker remarks (*Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus*, i, 175), after having given a résumé of the work of both Clemen and Sieffert, ". . . scheint die Sieffertsche 'Entwicklungslinie,' wenn man, was dieser Gelehrte freilich nicht tut, die Gefangenschaftsbriefe mit in Rechnung stellt, zur direkten Zickzacklinie zu werden."

[12] Quoted by Alford, *The Greek Testament*, iii, p. 55 (Gal. 5:11).

As a matter of fact, Paul occasionally makes definite reference to the law as a criterion for Christian conduct which gives weight to his own words: "Do I speak these things after the manner of men? or saith not the law also the same?" Then follow the familiar words of Deut. 25:4, which he declares were written for the Christians.[16] Or again his insistence that women keep silence in the churches is buttressed by an appeal to the law.[17] I Cor. 10:6-11 cites the case of the Israelites who, it is explained, suffered their misfortunes as "examples" (*τύποι*) for the Christians. Paul's teaching is that the

---

[13] Rom. 3:27.

[14] I Cor. 9:21.

[15] Gal. 6:2.

[16] I Cor. 9:8.

[17] I Cor. 14:34 "As also saith the law." It should be noted, however, that vv. 34 f. are difficult in this occasion and in seeming contradiction to 11:2–16, and that they are open to some suspicion textually, since several MSS. put them after v. 40. For this reason some scholars consider them a gloss by a later hand, perhaps based on I Tim. 2:12 (cf. J. Weiss, *Der erster Korintherbrief* in loc.).

Christians were the true descendants of the Old Testament worthies, the true children of Abraham. The Old Testament was the Bible for the Christians no less than for the Jews. It can hardly fail to have exerted a great influence upon their conduct. Again and again Paul uses the Old Testament in a "talismanic" fashion as if his statement, however true inherently it might be, needed to be buttressed by some reference. The catenæ of biblical quotations which he sometimes employs (cf. Gal. 3 and 4 often actually obscure his argument, and render it as fallacious as his conclusion itself is sound. To be sure the Christian does not perform an act because it is written in the law, but because under the influence of the Spirit, whereby God's will is revealed, he is impelled to do it. He can do nothing else. But, nevertheless, though the law no longer compelled obedience, actually it remained a criterion for Paul by virtue of his having become so impregnated with its content that many of its demands would seem perfectly natural and right to him—the only possible course for a God-fearing man. Paul would have denied that the command, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," was binding on the Christian by virtue of its being in the Mosaic law. Never, in fact, does he cite the Seventh Commandment as a proof of the enormity of the sin of adultery. In the one place where it is cited (Rom. 13:8 ff.) he introduces it in order to state that all such commandments are summed up in the one command, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Adultery was to be shunned because it was hostile to Christian life, or because it was contrary to what was worthy of a member of Christ's body, or for some similar reason. Yet was it not because he had been brought up among people who recognized this as the law that he felt such horror at sexual laxity and was so convinced that it was unworthy of one who was a member of Christ's body?

In conclusion, the Jewish law, while not the one criterion for conduct for Paul as it was for orthodox Jews, nevertheless did serve in this function by virtue of the cast it had given to his mind in his pre-Christian days. Freedom from law—Mosaic or any other—is not nearly so easily acquired as one sometimes supposes. Paul's attitude to the unwritten law will be considered in a later chapter.

THE Stoic too might well have answered that to fulfill God's will was the end of life, that conduct was good or bad in so far as it attained to this goal or at least was prompted by this ambition, and that the will of God was in a sense the criterion of conduct. "In a word, will nothing else than what God wills."[1] But while for the Jew, God's will was revealed in the Torah, for the Stoic, God had made no such written revelation. God was the universe; accordingly, to do God's will meant "to follow nature." But since this could be realized only in the light of reason, it followed that only the wise man was good. Rational inquiry, with everything subjected to its sway, was the means by which one could determine whether or not his conduct was in accord with nature. Epictetus expresses this explicitly:

> Socrates in this way became perfect, improving himself by everything, paying heed to nothing save reason. And though you are not yet a Socrates, you ought, however, to live as one who wishes to be a Socrates.[2]

And so he quotes with approval Socrates' word:

> I am always of such a disposition as to pay heed to nothing of my own save to the reason which on inquiry appears to me the best.[3]

[1] Epict. 2, 17, 22.

[2] *Ench.* 51, 3.

[3] 3, 23, 21 (Plato, *Crito* 6, p. 46B).

Or Seneca:

> That man is happy to whom reason recommends the whole posture of his affairs.[4]

For Paul it is quite different. No especial emphasis is laid on the use of rational inquiry, nor is reason treated as the guide of life. Passages such as, "Howbeit there is not in all men that knowledge"[5] or "That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you a spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him"[6] by no means invalidate this statement. The two or perhaps three passages in which some resemblance to the Stoic dictum, *sequi naturam*, may be detected may be mentioned, if only to show how incidental they are. In his terrible indictment of the immorality which resulted from idolatry Paul speaks of men and women changing their *natural* use into *that which is against nature* (τὴν φυσικὴν χρῆσιν εἰς τὴν παρὰ φύσιν)[7]. To buttress his argument that men should pray with heads unveiled, but that the reverse should be true for women, he introduces a most dubious illustration from comparative anatomy: "Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair it is a dishonor to him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her; for her hair is given her for a covering."[8] Some even see in the custom of clothing with greater honor those parts of the body considered less honorable[9] (which is for Paul a valid illustration of the diversity of spiritual gifts) a tacit reference to the Stoic maxim. But in these passages Paul is not enunciating formally the great criterion for Christian conduct, but is pointing his admonition or rebuke with appropriate and natural illustrations.

---

[4] *de Vit. Beat.* 6, 2.
[5] I Cor. 8:7.
[6] Eph. 1:17.
[7] Rom. 1:26 f. For further illustration of the phrase παρὰ φύσιν see p. 146, n. 42.
[8] I Cor. 11:14 f.

The phrase ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα,[10] which occurs in Rom. 1:28, has seemed to several interpreters of Paul an evidence of Stoic influence.[11] τὰ καθήκοντα was a technical Stoic term which, according to Diogenes Laertius,[12] had been introduced by Zeno. Zeno and his successors wrote treatises with the title περὶ τοῦ καθήκοντος,[13] which Cicero translated *de Officiis*. But though Aulus Gellius[14] might say, "In officiis . . . quæ καθήκοντα philosophi appellant," Cicero[15] makes clear that there was a distinction between καθῆκον (*medium officium*) and κατόρθωμα (*perfectum officium*), though declaring that *officium* is as good a term to translate καθῆκον as can be found.[16]

---

[9] I Cor. 12:22 ff.

[10] "To do those things which are not fitting."

[11] J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, p. 442; Lietzmann, *Handbuch*, in loc. For additional material concerning the term καθῆκον see K. Weidinger, *Die Haustafeln*, (1928), pp. 40–50.

[12] vii, 108—κατωνομάσθαι δ' οὕτως ὑπὸ πρώτου Ζήνωνος τὸ καθῆκον, ἀπὸ τοῦ κατά τινας ἥκειν τῆς προσονομασίας εἰλημμένης. Laertius defined it ὅσα λόγος αἱρεῖ ποιεῖν, ὡς ἔχει τὸ γονεῖς τιμᾶν, ἀδελφούς, πατρίδα, συμπεριφέρεσθαι φιλοῖς,—*loc. cit.*; cf. Epict. 2, 17, 31.

[13] Diog. Laert. vii, 25.

[14] *Noctes Atticæ* i, 13, 1.

[15] *de Off.* i, 3, 8.

[16] Atticus had felt some doubt regarding the accuracy of rendering καθῆκον by *officium*. In answer Cicero wrote (*ad Attic.* xvi, 14) " . . . mihi non est dubium quin, quod Græci καθῆκον nos 'officium.' Id autem quid dubitas quin etiam in rem publicam præclare caderet? Nonne dicimus consulum officium, senatus officium, imperatoris officium? Præclare convenit; aut da melius." See also *Commentarii in Diogenem Laertium*, ed. Hübnerus, (1833), ii, p. 101

Rackham,[17] a recent editor of the *de Finibus*, has expressed the difference in meaning: τὸ καθῆκον is the *appropriate act*—what the young and uncorrupted do by instinct. When the same aim is taken by the rational adult with full knowledge of nature's plan and deliberate attempt to conform with it, then the *appropriate act* is *perfect* and is a right action or success (κατόρθωμα[18]), or as Cicero himself defines it, *rectum factum.*[19] Epictetus[20] is fond of the term and uses it in much the same sense as does Cicero. It is *that which is fitting*, but it is fitting because it is one's duty. Accordingly, in the majority of instances in Epictetus and throughout M. Aurelius[21] duty is an adequate rendering.

But καθηκον(τα) with the verb καθήκω had not been cornered by the Stoics, nor was it limited to their technical meaning of duty. Herodotus[22] had used τὰ καθήκοντα as the equivalent of τὰ καθεστῶτα, "present state of affairs or circumstances," while Sophocles[23] wrote τοῦ καθήκοντος χρόνου, *i.e.*, "the appointed time." The question at once arises: Is Paul's use of this term (only in Rom. 1:28) to be explained as an instance of his borrowing from Stoic ethics? A negative answer seems demanded by the following considerations. The expression μὴ or οὐ καθηκον(τα) rarely, if ever, occurs in Stoic usage;[24] the opposite to what was καθῆκον was παρὰ τὸ καθῆκον. In the second place, Paul is not discussing duties or their violation, but "quæcumque essent indecora."

---

[17] Loeb Classical Library, *de Finibus*, p. xxi; cf. also Bonhöffer, *Epictet und das Neue Testament*, p. 154.

[18] Cf. Epict. 2, 26, 5.

[19] *de Fin.* iii, 14, 45.

[20] 1, 7, 1 and 21; 1, 18, 2; 1, 22, 15; 1, 28, 5; 2, 7, 1 and 15; 2, 10 (title); 2, 14, 18; 2, 17, 15 and 31; 3, 2, 2 and 4; 3, 7, 25; 3, 22, 43 and 69; 4, 4, 16; 4, 12, 16; *Ench.* 30 (*bis*).

[21] ἐγὼ τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ καθῆκον ποιῶ· τὰ ἄλλα με οὐ περισπᾷ 6, 22; cf. also 3, 1; 3, 16; 6, 26.

[22] i, 97; v, 49; vii, 104. Of course in the so-called Ionic κατηκ—.

[23] *O. T.* 75; cf. Dem., *c. Neæra* 80, p. 1372.

The Septuagint uses the word with a variety of meanings. For example, Exod. 16:16, 18 συναγάγετε . . . ἕκαστος εἰς τοὺς καθήκοντας, referring as it does to the gathering of the manna, signifies "according to his capacity." In Exod. 36:1 κατὰ τὰ ἅγια καθήκοντα can only be rendered "for the service of the sanctuary."[25] In II Macc. 6:4[26] there is a real parallel. The exact phrase (τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα) is used. The profanation of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes, with the resulting gross immorality and license, is being condemned, while Paul is speaking of the abominable immoralities which the heathens had brought upon themselves, due to improper worship. In III Macc. 4:16 the phrase is again used, when it is said that the impious king in the course of his idolatrous worship dared "speak against the most high God τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα."

To resume: The evidence would indicate (1) that the term καθηκον(τα), while used by the Stoics—but rarely if ever in the form τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα—and given by them a technical meaning embracing the whole circle of *officia*, had not been coined by them, but had been in use before they appropriated it and retained its original meaning of "fitting," "seemly," "decent," long afterward; and (2) that no source for Paul's usage need be sought outside the *koiné*, since the Septuagint attests its use here, and that, too, in the form of the negative eschewed by the philosophical writers.[27]

---

[24] Bonhöffer, *Epictet und das Neue Testament*, p. 157, denies its occurrence. Lietzmann, *op. cit.*, p. 33, on the other hand, quotes Epict. 3, 22, 43 (τὸ μὴ καθῆκον) and Plutarch, *de Comm. Not.* 12, p. 1064 (καθήκει ζῆν καὶ παρὰ τὸ μὴ καθῆκον). It is to be observed that in both cases the μὴ is textually insecure, in the latter having been omitted by Bernardakis, Teubner series, 1895). Lietzmann also refers to "Philo, *de Mut. Nom*, 41, p. 615 M" as evidencing this "simpler" negative. The reference should be 42 (§241), and the word is not καθήκοντα, but προσήκοντα. Even if the two former references do provide examples of the occurrence of this negative, the evidence is conclusive that they are but very rare exceptions to the ordinary usage.

[25] Cf. also Exod. 5:13, 19; 16:21; I Macc. 12:11; II Macc. 6:21.

[26] τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἱερὸν ἀσωτίας καὶ κώμων ὑπὸ τῶν ἐθνῶι ἐπεπληροῦτο ῥᾳθυμούντων μεθ' ἑταιρῶν, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς περιβόλων γυναιξὶ πλησιαζόντων, ἔτι δὲ τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα ἔνδον εἰσφερόντων.

In a later chapter we shall have occasion to see that the ideal of "propriety," "what was seemly," bulked large for Paul, but there is danger of reading more into those phrases than is legitimate. J. Weiss[28] sees unmistakable evidences that in the use of words such as εὐσχημοσύνη, εὐάρεστος, ἀρετή[29] and ἔπαινος Paul the Hellenist, on whom Greek culture with its æsthetic motif had made its impress, stands revealed, and again that in the case of immorality which is παρὰ φύσιν it is the shame to the body (cf. ἀτιμάζεσθαι) that horrifies Paul. But it should be remembered that the enormity to Paul consisted in the fact that actually the bodies were members of Christ,[30] and that immorality thus joined Christ to a harlot. The body was sacred because *in it* the Holy Spirit resided.

When in Eph. 5:3 f. Paul warns his readers to refrain from defiling their lips by even mentioning the debasing sins of fornication and uncleanness and covetousness "as becometh saints," it hardly seems necessary to import a Greek æsthetic idea. Centuries before, in attempting to dissuade Amnon, Tamar had said, "Nay, my brother, do not force me; *for no such thing ought to be done in Israel.*"[31] Ideas of what is and is not fitting are very sharply defined among primitive peoples. Throughout the history of the Hebrews the consciousness of what was fitting for them as Jehovah's chosen people had been constantly stressed. With that for a heritage, with his emphasis on moral purity, and with his exalted conception of Christ and the privilege of being *in Christ*, phrases such as "Only let your manner of life be worthy of the gospel of Christ,"[32] "Walk worthily of the Lord unto all pleasing,"[33] "Walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called"[34] are self-explanatory.

---

[27] Cf. παρὰ τὸ καθῆκον, I Clem. 41, 3.

[28] *Paulus u. Jesus*, p. 71; answered by K. Deissner, *Paulus und Seneca*, pp. 33 f.

[29] ἀρετή occurs only in Phil. 4:8. It is elsewhere apparently shunned by the apostle as a heathen term for virtue.

[30] Cf. I Cor. 6:15.

Furthermore, he was intensely concerned lest by the misuse of the doctrine of freedom the Christians should incur reproaches and bring defame upon the name of Christ. This prophylactic motive is clearly seen in Rom. 12:17,[35] "Take thought for things honorable (καλά) in the sight of all men." Morality and decency of conduct, avoidance of all that would give offense to decent men or a loophole for attack to scoffers, were what Paul was urging by καλά. Its use, accordingly, is not to be inter-

[31] II Sam. 13:12.
[32] Phil. 1:27.
[33] Col. 1:10.
[34] Eph. 4:1; similarly I Thes. 2:12.
[35] Cf. also I Thes. 4:12.

preted as an evidence that Paul identified the good and the beautiful as did the early Greeks. For them the good was the beautiful; conversely, that which was not beautiful could not be good. This note is stressed by the tragedians, particularly Sophocles, and made itself felt in the language itself by such terms as καλὸς κ' ἀγαθός (originally applied to the nobles or *gentlemen*—cf. *optimates*, *prudhommes*, *gute Männer*) coming to be used of the perfect man, "as he should be." Plato adopted this view, instinctive to every Greek, and "intertwined the beautiful and the good," although the Stoics (but not the Epicureans) laid little emphasis on beauty. But this identification of the beautiful and the good was never made by a Jew. It seems, accordingly, entirely arbitrary to force into Paul's words any such content.

In Rom. 12:2 Paul does link εὐάρεστον (well-pleasing) with ἀγαθόν (good) and τέλειον (perfect), but the phrase τῷ θεῷ εὐάρεστον[36] in the preceding verse makes very clear his meaning. Acts were not to be done because they were lovely or beautiful, but because they were worthy of the high calling to which the Christian had been called. Due to his heredity and environment Paul shrank from certain conduct and approved other, but there is no evidence that he ever consciously set up as the criterion for conduct that which was in itself worthy or fitting or pleasing, that is, that he objectified goodness or duty apart from results, as did the Stoics. For him it was always that which was worthy of the *Lord,* worthy of his *gospel,* acceptable to *God.* To the Stoic abstract duty was the requirement; to Paul, as to any other Jew, it was duty to God. Morals and religion were identical.

---

[36] Rom. 12:1. Cf. εὐάρεστος τῷ θεῷ, Rom. 14:18; εὐάρεστοι αὐτῷ (sc. κυριῷ), II Cor. 5:9; εὐάρεστον τῷ κυρίῳ, Eph. 5:10; εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, Phil. 4:18; εὐάρεστόν ἐστιν ἐν κυρίῳ, Col. 3:20.

Another term employed by Paul which raises the question of the apostle's contact with Stoic thought is συνείδησις (conscience).[37] Of it Lightfoot wrote:

> The most important of moral terms, the crowning triumph of ethical nomenclature, συνείδησις, conscientia, the internal, absolute, supreme judge of individual action, if not struck in the mint of the Stoics, at all events became current coin through their influence.[38]

It is to be observed, however, that the word does not occur at all in Epictetus (except in *Fgm.* 97, which is generally regarded as spurious),[39] while its Attic equivalent συνειδός appears but once.[40] M. Aurelius refrains from the use of either word although the late compound εὐσυνείδητος occurs once.[41] While those writers are rather later than Paul and their works but fragmentary, this almost complete neglect is surprising and should caution us from asserting too dogmatically their universal use by Stoics at the beginning of the Christian era. The sayings attributed to Menander, "Conscience is for all mortals god"[42] and "Conscience is for us all god,"[43] as well as the answers of Bias and Periander to the queries what would make one fearless and free,[44] may be open to fair suspicion as being comparatively late—Schmidt[45] argues for Christian influence—yet the terms *συνειδός* and *συνείδησις* were increasingly common from the third century on. They occur of consciousness, awareness, perception of one's thoughts, as well as of the (moral) consciousness of right or wrong doing which is closer to our conception of conscience. Yet it is to be noticed that regularly the words when used in this latter sense are restricted to the conception of conscience, the judge which passes judgment on completed acts, not on conscience, the legislator which guides one to his decisions. It was because the term *τὸ συνειδός* was linked so completely with the shame that followed the act rather than with the fear that checked it that Plato paid such little heed to it. It is Cephalus, the aged and garrulous representative of the old morality, who stresses with complacency the terrors of the wicked and "the sweet hope of him who is conscious of no sin."[46] One reason which perhaps led the Greek Stoics to avoid the term *συνείδησις*, although (like Epictetus) they often mentioned the action, was the emphasis laid by the Epicureans upon the idea of the guilty conscience.

---

[37] In addition to the works referred to in the following paragraphs mention may be made of the monograph by P. Ewald, *De Vocis Συνειδήσεως apud scriptores N. T. vi ac potestate* (1883); C. Martha, *Études morales sur l'antiquité* (1883); L. Schmidt, *Die Ethik der alten Griechen* (1882), i, pp. 156–229; and the excellent article, "Conscience (Greek and Roman)," by W. H. S. Jones in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics,* ed. Hastings, iv, pp. 37–41.

[38] *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians,* p. 303.

[39] Bonhöffer, *op. cit.,* p. 156.

[40] 3, 22, 94.

[41] 6, 30 (end).

---

[42] *Γνῶμαι μονόστιχοι*, v. 654. *Fragmenta Poetarum Comediæ Novæ*, ed. Meineke (1841), iv, p. 359.

[43] *Op. cit.*, v. 597—iv, p. 357.

[44] *Βίας ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ἂν εἴη τῶν κατὰ βίον ἄφοβον εἶπεν ὀρθὴ συνείδησις*—Stobaeus, *Florilegium* xxiv, 11. *Περίανδρος ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ἐστιν ἐλευθερία εἶπεν ἀγαθὴ συνείδησις*—*Ibid.* xxiv, 12.

[45] *Das Gewissen* (1889), p. 6, n. 1.

[46] Plato, *Republic* i, p. 331A(*τῷ δὲ μηδὲν ἑαυτῷ ἄδικον ξυνειδότι ἡδεῖα ἐλπὶς ἀεὶ πάρεστι καὶ ἀγαθὴ γηροτρόφος*).

In the Latin writers the term *conscientia* is extremely common, especially in Cicero[47] and Seneca.[48] Though occasionally used of consciousness, that is, common knowledge about something (either of external objects or of internal qualities), it came more and more to be restricted to the moral realm, often with the qualifying adjectives good (*bona*) or bad (*mala*).[49] The fondness which Seneca shows for the term apparently results from his view that the *summum bonum* in life is the state of tranquillity and peace which results from a complete mastery of the passions which distract. Accordingly, what can be worse than the unrest and disquiet of the man who seeks but in vain to escape from remorse which follows him relentlessly, go where he will, and crimsons his cheek and disturbs his sleep? Thus actually conscience, of which he may say,

> A holy spirit indwells within us, one who marks our good and bad deeds, and is our guardian,[50]

is practically another name for reason itself, and like its fellow sets its face against all emotions and affections. "I will do nothing for opinion, everything because of conscience."[51]

---

[47] Cf. Städlin, *Geschichte der Lehre von dem Gewissen* (1824), pp. 313–316.

[48] Cf. Böhlig, "Das Gewissen bei Seneca and Paulus," *Theol. Studien und Kritiken* (1914), pp. 1–24.

[49] Seneca occasionally uses *conscientia* absolutely to signify bad conscience (although more commonly writing *mala conscientia*), but rarely uses it unqualified when referring to the reverse.

[50] "Sacer inter nos spiritus sedet, malorum bonorumque nostrorum observator et custos"—*Ep. Mor.* 41, 2.

[51] *de Vit. Beat.* 20, 4; cf. Epict. 3, 24, 50.

All this should warn us against the hasty assumption that because Paul uses the word conscience with comparative frequency[52] he is using it as Seneca might. It may be freely admitted with Sanday that it is "one of the few technical terms in St. Paul which seems to have Greek rather than Jewish affinities."[53] In fact it occurs only twice in the Septuagint, and in only one of these two instances in the sense of conscience.

> For wickedness is cowardly by nature and when convicted gives evidence that such is the case, and has ever aggravated the grievous things when hard pressed by conscience (συνεχομένη τῇ συνειδήσει).[54]

But his dependence seems hardly more than verbal. The term was in use in the Greek-speaking world, and as such he took it, and used it as he chose.

For Paul, as for the ancients in general, conscience was not the equivalent of the term in modern usage, but was much more restricted, signifying *conscientia consequens moralis*—that is, the approving or disapproving verdict of the man's moral nature after the act. Thus conscience was not a standard or criterion for conduct. It was the capacity for moral judgment rather than the source of moral ought. The memory of previous adverse judgments might well be retained and influence future conduct, but not so much as a standard as a motive. While for the Stoic this verdict was dependent upon reason—if he committed unwise deeds his cheeks would be mantled with shame though none were there to see—and so the voice of conscience accused the man before himself, for Paul it was quite the reverse. Christians were led by the Spirit of God, were aided and directed into the paths they should tread by its guidance.[55] If they went astray, they were guilty not of an afront to reason, but of one to God himself. And thus the guilty conscience of the sinner accuses him before God or Christ. "For I know nothing against myself; yet am I not thereby justified: but he that judgeth me is the Lord."[56]

---

[52] It occurs fourteen times, always in the form συνείδησις—Rom. 2:15; 9:1; 13:5; I Cor. 8:7, 10, 12; 10:25, 27, 28, 29 (*bis*); II Cor. 1:12; 4:2; 5:11.

[53] *ICC Romans*, p. 61 (2:15).

[54] *Wisdom of Solomon* 17:11. In Eccles. 10:20 (the only other instance) it signifies "thought." In Sirach 42:18 it is certainly to be replaced by εἴδησιν.

Accordingly, we are apparently justified again in concluding that while Paul occasionally adopts the phraseology of his contemporaries, he uses the borrowed terms with as entire unconcern for their original meanings and implicates as do many of his Christian successors in the pulpit today.

In a passage which in spite of its other obscurities reveals Paul's conception of conscience as a *post eventum* judge,

> For when Gentiles that have not the law do by nature the things of the law, these, not having the law, are the law unto themselves; in that they show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith [or perhaps better "thereto"], and their thoughts one with another accusing or else excusing them.[57]

is the reference to unwritten law for the Gentile. Though he never had the Mosaic law, he cannot plead that as an excuse, for God has implanted in all men a capacity to recognize, at least partially, the essential obligations of moral law. This is engraven in his heart as the Mosaic law was communicated on Sinai to the Jew. Gentiles who ignored the one and Jews who transgressed the other were liable to the same condemnation. But we must not strive to stress this unduly and make Paul say that the Gentile had as complete an unwritten law as the Torah of Judaism. He is merely asserting that all men, Jew and Gentile alike, are responsible before God, for to all he has made his will known. That it is as impossible for the Gentile to be saved by following this unwritten law as for the Jew by following the Torah is implicit in Paul's thought, and for the same reason—namely, because man is morally unable to obey them. Intrinsically, there is the same possibility for the heathen to be saved by obeying the law in his nature as there is for the Jew to be saved by obeying the Torah; but actually, both are impossible. Morality was not to be achieved by any external code of regulations, but only through the new divine life which results from union with Christ.

---

[55] Cf., for example, Rom. 8:14, 26; I Cor. 2:10; Gal. 5:25.

[56] I Cor. 4:4.

[57] Rom. 2:14–16.

The question is often raised: To what extent was this teaching of the unwritten law derived from Stoicism? The answer is difficult and competent scholars are ranged on both sides. Lietzmann[58] remarks:

> That all moral conduct is the consequence of the laws implanted in us by nature and that it is rooted in deity is the fundamental precept of Stoic ethics,

---

[58] *Römerbrief*, p. 39.

and cites two illustrative passages.[59] A. Bonhöffer,[60] on the contrary, maintains that law for the Stoic was the equivalent of practical reason (λόγος ὀρθός) which, far from being written in the hearts of all men by nature, could be acquired only by the most painstaking search and discipline, by the resolute limiting of one's desires to those things alone over which he had control and by the refusal to be concerned with anything else; and that, accordingly, for Stoic teachers the unwritten law was not a gift of nature to all, but was the most precious possession of the philosopher alone, gained only as the result of constant discipline and effort; and that Rom. 2:14 ff. cannot be explained on the basis of Stoicism.

Without attempting to pass judgment on the disagreement regarding what the term meant for Stoicism,[61] I think it may be ventured that while Paul may have known the Stoic teaching on this point conscious borrowing need not be postulated. The conviction of the universal responsibility before God and the idea of the approving and reproving conscience are sufficient to demand some such idea as this νόμος (law) which actually gave to conscience its content and which saves God from the charge of arbitrary injustice.

[59] Chrysippus (quoted by Plut., *de Stoicorum Repugnantia* 9, p. 1035C) οὐ γάρ ἐστιν εὑρεῖν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἄλλην ἀρχὴν οὐδ' ἄλλην γένεσιν ἢ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ Διὸς καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως· ἐντεῦθεν γὰρ δεῖ πᾶν τὸ τοιοῦτον τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχειν, εἰ μέλλομέν τι ἐρεῖν περὶ ἀγαθῶν καὶ κακῶν and Cic., *de Legibus* i, 6, 18—*lex est ratio summa, insita in natura, quae iubet ea quae facienda sunt prohibetque contraria.*

[60] *Epictet und das Neue Testament*, p. 154.

[61] The objection may be raised that Bonhöffer tends to blur the distinction between the ability to know what is right and the ability to do it, yet of course the answer is fair that the Stoic following Socrates would assert that if a man knew what was right he would do it.

Actually this unwritten law did not bulk very large in Paul's thought; it gave conscience its "content," but that was about all. It would be wrong to feel that Paul had worked these two ideas out completely, and that in his view a man instinctively knew by virtue of this divinely implanted law just what was right or advisable in every circumstance that might arise and could thus find the approved act ready at hand, as the Jew might have done in the Torah. The true criterion was not to be found here. As a matter of fact, it is reasonable to suppose that had the Gentiles insisted that this unwritten law was sufficient for them Paul would have attacked it as strenuously as he did the Torah of the Jews. Before the revelation of Christ the Gentiles had an instinctive consciousness of what was wrong, and were reproved by their conscience if they transgressed, but they were quite unable to attain to the stature of the Christian man, in fact, could not even know what this was. It was only as it was revealed by the Spirit as they entered into actual relationship with Christ that they could see what was required and that they could feel the quickening power making possible the new life.

Thus it is seen that this section is almost entirely negative in its results. Conformity to nature was not the criterion for Paul, nor was appeal made to rational inquiry as the agent which would reveal what was right, nor was the phrase *ὁ περὶ τὸ καθῆκον*, of which Epictetus was fond, used as if in itself it expressed a standard of conduct. On the contrary, Paul's emphasis is on living worthily. Conscience, far from setting the standard, was the *post eventum* judge. The unwritten law which was the possession of all men, while affording rudimentary knowledge and making all responsible before God, by no means afforded a clear standard for conduct worthy of the Christian living in mystical union with his Lord. It made all liable to punishment, but failed to provide the way of escape.

But although these conclusions are essentially negative, they are perhaps not without value when there is much loose and inexact talk about Paul's debt to Stoicism, since they reveal where Paul did *not* lay his emphasis, and thus compel us to focus our attention upon the point where Paul *did* lay his emphasis, namely, the mystical union of the believer with Christ and the resulting union of the brethren in Christ. Here it was that the real criterion for the Christian was to be found. This we shall consider in the next chapter.

The new ethic is not precisely the life lived in accordance with the "law of Christ" (although this expression occurs once—Gal. 6:2), but a life resulting from union with Christ, from the fulness of the Spirit.[1]

THIS statement of J. Weiss indicates the sphere in which we must look for the ultimate criterion for Christian conduct in the eyes of Paul. It is through the mystical union of the believer with Christ that the new life is revealed and made possible, we might almost say inevitable, for him. But Weiss' statement also suggests the well-known fact of Paul's almost complete silence concerning the earthly life of Jesus. Although this phenomenon has been often and ably discussed, it has seemed necessary at this point in our investigation to consider to what extent—if any—the words and example of Jesus served as criteria for the conduct of Paul and his churches.

Jesus' commands are cited by Paul very rarely as setting the standard. In emphasizing the need of forbearance (I Cor. 9) he had told the Corinthians that he did not ask them to forego more than he did; that for their sakes he had forgone not only what any Christian might claim, but what he could claim as an apostle. Even the Old Testament (v. 9) allowed the laborer to eat the fruit of his work. Now in v. 14 he states the direct command of Jesus:

---

[1] J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, p. 119.

> Even so did the Lord ordain that they that proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel.

A command similar to this is preserved in Matt. 10:9 ff. (cf. Luke 10:7 f.) in the words "for the laborer is worthy of his food." Concluding his words on spiritual gifts, Paul says:

> If any man thinketh himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are (the commandment) of the Lord.[2]

This command is not preserved in the recorded words of Jesus. Resch, *Agrapha*, p. 31, (ed. 1906)[3], assumes an unrecorded saying of Jesus and limits the command to vv. 34 ff.; *i.e.*, to the question of the women speaking in Corinth. It seems more probable that by "the things which I write unto you" he means to include all that he had written in the section regarding the *pneumatikoi* (chaps. 11-14). If so, the word ἐντολή (commandment) cannot be adduced as evidence that Paul possessed a saying of Jesus unknown to us, but is rather to be explained on the basis of his mystical union with Christ; that through his consciousness of this union Paul felt that since he had the mind of Christ his words were really Christ's own words, that Christ was speaking through him.[4]

---

[2] I Cor. 14:37.

[3] Cf. also Resch, *Die Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu*, p. 463.

[4] This passage is further complicated by two textual problems.

(1) BℵA (*θεου* pro *κυριου*) read *οτι κυριου εστιν εντολη* D$^{\text{b et c}}$ EKL vg syr$^{\text{utr}}$ read *οτι κυριου εισιν εντολαι* D* F$^{\text{gr}}$ G d e g Or read *οτι κυριου εστιν.*

In I Cor. 7:10 f. regarding divorce he writes:

> But unto the married I give charge, yea not I, but the Lord, that the wife depart not from her husband (but should she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband); and that the husband leave not his wife.

This is apparently to be seen as an interpretation of Jesus' well-known attitude toward divorce, "What therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder" (Mark 10:9; Matt. 19:6). It is surely unwise to feel that Paul is here quoting from a collection of Jesus' logia. Rather, as he discussed the relations of the sexes, he finds in the particular case of those already married (as in contrast to the unmarried, widows, partners in mixed marriages, and "virgins") an earlier judgment of Jesus known to him and his followers which buttresses his words. Again, it is unwise to feel that he is referring to such words as those preserved in Mark 10:11, 12. The amplification of the prohibition of all divorce to include the action of the woman as well as of the man is certainly to be seen as due to Paul himself and not to his obedience to a tradition known to him. Mark 10:12, the only passage in the Gospels which puts

---

The second of these readings may safely be disregarded as a correction to conform to the plural ἃ γράφω. In spite of the weighty evidence for the first reading the probability that D F^{gr} G Latt preserve the primitive reading is high.

(2) The position of vv. 34, 35 is uncertain. DEFGdefg Ambrst Sedul place them after 40; fu inserts vv. 36–40 before v. 34. The textual uncertainty, the awkward introduction of a reference to the women in the midst of a discussion of spiritual gifts, the apparent contradiction of these verses with 11:2–6, the striking similarity with I Tim. 2:11 f. arouse the suspicion that we have here a marginal gloss by a later hand which was incorporated in the text of most MSS. after v. 33, but in a few after v. 40.

such a word in Jesus' mouth, can be confidently regarded as a necessary addition to the tradition of Jesus' words in circles where Roman jurisprudence allowed the wife to divorce the husband, but which is unthinkable as coming from a Jew to Jews where such was not the case. Again, I Cor. 7:12, 25 attest the existence of such traditional sayings of the Lord, but this time Paul has none to quote:

> But to the rest say I, not the Lord (v. 12),

> Now concerning virgins I have no commandment (ἐπιταγὴν) of the Lord, but I give my judgment (γνώμην) (v. 25).

But these imply that while he has no traditional command of Jesus to assert as final authority in these particular matters, he does have on other points. Some such explanation as this seems more probable than that he is seeking to differentiate his statements when inspired by the Lord from his own (uninspired?) opinions.

Another passage, I Cor. 11:23, is more difficult. In speaking of the proper conduct of Christians at the Lord's Supper he says,

> For I received of [*i.e.*, from] the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread, etc.[5]

Much critical ingenuity has been expended on this verse. Arguments have been advanced from the ἐγώ and from the ἀπό, convincing to them who already held the view under defense, but hardly constituting proof for others. How did Paul get this information? by direct revelation from Jesus or otherwise? The simplest explanation would seem to be that Paul had received through natural, not supernatural, means a primitive tradition of the institution of the ceremony by the Lord himself. The "of the Lord" would then refer to the ultimate source or authority. However he had obtained his information, it was to him the word of the Lord and as such was authoritative for Christians as prescribing their conduct.[6]

---

[5] ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι κτλ.

In his encouragement to the Thessalonian Christians with regard to their friends who have died, Paul introduces his description of the nature of the Parousia with the words, "For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord."[7] It may well be that by the phrase ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου Paul means that a definite word of the historical Jesus is known to him, but attempts to find such a word in the recorded utterances of Jesus have not been successful. Whether the agraphon is to be seen imbedded in vv. 16–17 even in paraphrase is also a question. In lieu of any real evidence it is perhaps wisest to conclude that while some saying of Jesus regarding the Parousia was probably known to Paul and thus served to buttress his statement, it is impossible from the nature of his words to determine whether he is paraphrasing the saying or interpreting it.[8]

---

[6] I Cor. 15:3 is probably to be interpreted in the same way. Paul is not asserting that he received his knowledge by vision, but is merely emphasizing the fact that he did not invent it. He is imparting it in the same manner in which he received it. Cf. also I Cor. 11:2 "Hold fast the traditions, even as I delivered them to you."

[7] I Thes. 4:15.

Some, as Frame, see in Rom. 14:14, "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean of itself," an allusion to Mark 7:15. But it is equally possible that Paul is not thinking of any traditional utterance of Jesus, but is giving his own judgment, which, because of his fellowship and union with the Lord, he is confident expresses the Lord's will.[9] Similarly, I Thes. 4:2 ("For ye know what charge we gave you through the Lord Jesus"), II Thes. 3:6 ("Now we command you, brethren, in the name of the Lord Jesus"), and 3:12 ("Now them that are such we command and exhort in the Lord Jesus Christ") are to be understood. He is not speaking on his own authority; it is the indwelling Christ who is speaking in him (II Cor. 13:3).

These passages prove that Paul possessed the tradition of at least a few utterances of Jesus on matters of conduct which served him as a guide. To these he would refer as to the final authority. Their number, however, was so limited that they failed to meet the majority of problems. In addition to explicit sayings that might serve to point his own instruction Paul may well have been familiar with considerable tradition about Jesus. It is surely unwise to see a conflict between his explicit denial of having received his gospel from men and his sympathetic appreciation of whatever friends of Jesus might have told him.

---

[8] Cf. Ropes, *Die Sprüche Jesu*, pp. 152–154; Resch, *Paulinismus*, pp. 338–341; Dibelius, *Lietzmann Handb.* in loc.; Frame, *ICC* in loc.

[9] Cf. I Cor. 4:17; 5:10; Phil. 2:24; II Thes. 3:4.

Emphasis is laid on Paul's insistence that his gospel was not from men, but direct from Christ (Gal. 1:11 f., 17), and that, since in all probability he had never known Jesus in his lifetime, the only way he could have become acquainted with Christ's commands and words was by direct inspiration. This sort of reasoning so common to interpreters of Paul quite misses the fact that to make his point he often used exaggeration. It is surely a mistake to take his figures and exaggerations literally. In his opposition to the Judaizers in Galatians Paul parries the charge that his gospel is different from theirs. It is, indeed, and that is its chief merit. His independence of them precludes the view that he has gained his message from them and that it must square with theirs. It had come direct from God and must be accepted at its face value, not compared with any other. Much had been miraculously revealed to him (Gal. 1:12; 2:2; II Cor. 12:1, 8 f.), but is there any reason to suppose that he felt that all he had absorbed from contact with men who had known Jesus and from sayings of Jesus which they had preserved was thus worthless simply because it had not been miraculously revealed to him direct? When put bluntly, the absurdity of such a view is manifest. Such statements about Paul are convincing only so long as they are couched in veiled generalities.[10]

His oral instruction and his writings alike were probably decidedly influenced by such material, yet this should not obscure the fact that attempts to show verbal parallels between his writings and the traditional sayings of Jesus recorded in our gospels have not been wholly convincing.[11] The most thorough-going of these attempts was made by Resch[12] who found traces of Paul's use of the original gospel, which he called τὰ λόγια, in nearly every verse of his entire correspondence. Other scholars, while avoiding the extremes of Resch, incline to the view that occasional reminiscences may be detected.[13] I Cor. 13 and Col. 3, however, are not so much reminiscent of words of Jesus, as Weiss[14] maintains, as evidence of an ethical outlook on life essentially the same for Jesus and Paul. As Wernle has well said,

---

[10] See also Jülicher, *Paul and Jesus*, p. 55.

> Paul never knew Jesus during his lifetime, but nevertheless it was he who best understood Him.[15]

Rom. 2:28, 29 ("For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly . . . but he is a Jew who is one inwardly") is not to be explained as a reminiscence of the parable of the Good Samaritan, but as an evidence that Paul and Jesus were at one on this teaching. I Cor. 13 is not reminiscent of words of Jesus, but allows actually Jesus' personality to shine through because Paul is so completely in Christ that he has the "mind of Christ."

It is far wiser to seek to explain the parallels in this way than to comb the gospels and the epistles as did Resch in an attempt to find verbal agreements. One can hardly doubt that in many cases the sayings attributed to Jesus at least in their present form are to be assigned to the authors of the gospels. Accordingly, there is always the possibility that apparent parallels between the gospels and Paul are to be explained as the result of both tapping the same source and of being influenced by similar experiences.[16] Jesus and Paul were both good Jews, brought up in a Jewish atmosphere, and with an outlook on life particularly in ethical matters distinctively Jewish. Though Paul had not known Jesus, since his conversion he had been brooding over subjects similar to those on which Jesus taught. "To do God's will, to make all things redound to the glory of God," was the aim of both; the result was an essential harmony of thought and expression.[17]

---

[11] Among others, Titius, *Die neut. Lehre von der Seligkeit* (ed. 1900), ii, pp. 8–18.

[12] *Die Logia Jesu nach dem griechischen und hebraischen Text wiederhergestellt; Die Paulinismus und die Logia Jesu.*

[13] For example, J. Weiss, *Paul and Jesus*, p. 21.

[14] *Op. cit.*, pp. 114 f.

[15] Wernle, *Beginnings of Christianity*, i, p. 159.

Similarities of idea between the apostle and the gospels do occur. Resemblances such as I Cor. 3:19 with Matt. 11:25 (cf. Luke 10:21); Rom. 13:7 with Mark 12:17 and parallels; Rom. 12:14 with Luke 6:28 (cf.

---

[16] Nor is the possibility to be overlooked that Paul may well have been acquainted with some of Jesus' words in a form more primitive than that in which they stand in the gospels. Again, Paul's habit of taking material from every available source and then thoroughly transforming it and making it a part of himself is always to be borne in mind. This may well explain the similarities in Paul observed by every critic with Judaism, Stoicism, the mysteries, and perhaps with Jesus.

[17] "Paul's thought is not a continuous development from the thought of Jesus, but is in a measure a new start, yet so controlled by the supreme expression of Jesus' nature, not in words but in his life and death, that it is fully dependent upon Jesus and in fundamental harmony with him"—Ropes, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 139 f.

Matt. 5:44) of which Titius[18] refers to more than 100 might be cited to illustrate a literary dependence were that already proved. In themselves they prove nothing more than an essential harmony of thought on matters moral and a common use of language. Thus the real problem is not that Paul so rarely quotes Jesus' words, nor refers to his earthly life so little, but that he so often agrees without any real literary dependence.

Here finally we find the ultimate criterion for Paul. Those words of Jesus that were known to Paul were of the utmost importance and were used by him to point his warnings, but after all they were but fragmentary. He had never known Jesus after the flesh, but he did know the risen Christ, who had transformed his life, with whom he had died to sin, in whom he had risen from the dead, and unto whose perfect stature he was constantly growing. His eyes were no longer set on earthly standards; Christ was the object of his gaze and his longing. His burning purpose was to present every man, himself included,[19] perfect in Christ.[20] To the man who was really in Christ the new life would be revealed, and in such a manner that he would feel himself impelled toward it. The Christian would be so completely linked to Christ that he would not be able to distinguish between his desires and goals and those of his Lord. He would have the mind of Christ,[21] which meant far more than "thinking like Christ," but that actually Christ himself thought in him. So in a real way Christ became his examplar. This is expressed in its classic form in Phil. 2:1–11.[22] Here Paul buttresses his argument by the example of Jesus, who, far from seeking to exalt himself, humbled himself and through obedience was highly exalted. It is not improbable that these verses are to be understood in line with the contrast Paul liked to draw between Adam, the first man, and Christ, the last man.[23] Adam had desired to be equal with God, and had stretched out his hand to grasp the fruit which would make this equality possible. Jesus, far from striving to grasp this equality (cf. ἁρπαγμὸν v. 6), voluntarily humbled himself. He became thus the great example.[24]

---

[18] *Op. cit.*, pp. 12–18. It is surprising to observe that Titius leaves unnoticed the similarity between I Cor. 7:32–35 and Luke 10:40–42. In maintaining the superiority of celibacy to married life Paul remarks *ὁ ἄγαμος μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κυρίου, πῶς ἀρέσῃ τῷ κυρίῳ· ὁ δὲ γαμήσας μεριμνᾷ τὰ τοῦ κόσμου, πῶς ἀρέσῃ τῇ γυναικί, κτλ.* (vv. 32b–33a), and similarly in the case of women (vv. 33b, 34), and urges that his desire that they refrain from marriage was not prompted by a desire to deprive them of any freedom, but was *πρὸς τὸ εὔσχημον καὶ εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ ἀπερισπάστως* (v. 35b). In Luke it is said *ἡ δὲ Μάρθα περιεσπᾶτο περὶ πολλὴν διακονίαν*, and that to her Jesus said . . . *μεριμνᾷς καὶ θορυβάζῃ περὶ πολλά*, while Mary was praised because her attention was not distracted but centered upon Jesus' words. In both passages the advantage lay in freedom from all the "cares" that would "distract" the attention from the Lord. The same word *μεριμνᾶν* is used in both passages, while the adverb *ἀπερισπάστως* (I Cor. 7:35) is from the same root as *περιεσπᾶτο* (Luke 10:40), each occurring in these passages alone in the New Testament. Probably this sole occurrence of the latter words is not significant, but it tends to make the similarity more noticeable. Very possibly this resemblance is to be explained as also due to harmony of thought and exigency of language, yet it cannot be denied that knowledge on the part of Paul of a logion like this about Martha *might* have influenced this turn of his expression. It is one of the cases insufficient in themselves to afford proof, but raising un unanswered question in the student's mind. This is noted also by J. C. Hawkins, *Horæ Synopticæ*,^{2} p. 196 n.

---

[19] I Cor. 9:27.

[20] Col. 1:28 f.

[21] I Cor. 2:16.

[22] Cf. II Cor. 8:9; Eph. 5:2.

[23] Rom. 5:12–19; I Cor. 15:22, 45–49. For a discussion with parallel passages of this idea of the first and second man, see Lietzmann, *Handbuch* I Cor. 15:45.

Paul realized that many of his converts were still babes in Christ.[25] Precept and example were essential. He was truly πνευματικός; the Holy Spirit dwelt in him; he was an apostle of the Lord Jesus Christ and as such could speak with authority to his brethren. Since his experience was great and his feeling of fellowship with the Lord keen, his advice was of value; on particular points[26] he could give his judgments which they might accept in confidence.[27] His preaching and his gospel were such that they could be safely followed; he might be taken as an example, for he had taken his pattern from Christ. By his word, "Become imitators[28] of me" or "Become imitators of me, even as I also am of Christ,"[29]

---

[24] No Aristotelian nor Platonic influence is to be assumed behind the word μορφή (form) which has so troubled commentators. If this view is right, Paul was not thinking of Aristotle, but of Genesis.

[25] I Cor. 3:1.

[26] *E.g.*, I Cor. 7:25.

[27] Cf. I Cor. 14:37.

[28] I Cor. 4:16; Phil. 3:17; cf. I Thes. 1:6; 2:14; II Thes. 3:7, 9. Weiss (*Paul and Jesus*, pp. 116 f.) points out that the term μιμητής was common in Greek speech not only of one who followed a teacher, but of one who "followed" the gods (ἕπεσθαι τοῖς θεοῖς, cf. Eph. 5:1; Matt. 5:48)—a Jewish idea as well—and cites several illustrative passages (Xen., *Mem.* i, 6, 3; Plut., *de Sera Num. Vind.* 5, p. 550 DE).

[29] I Cor. 11:1. In spite of the usual explanation that one of the greatest advantages that Christianity had in its struggle with the other mystery cults was its possession of a historic figure as its Lord, the student of early Christian history is struck by the little emphasis that was laid on just this point. Harnack has rightly observed:

"To 'imitate' or 'be like' Christ did not occupy the place one would expect among the ethical counsels of the age. Jesus had spoken of imitating God and bidden man follow himself, whilst the relationship of pupil and teacher readily suggested the formula of imitation. But whenever he was recognized as Messiah, as the Son of God, as Saviour and as Judge, the idea of imitation

Paul is not setting himself up as infallible, but is referring to himself simply as an example. They were to hearken to what he had taught them and to remember his manner of life. "The things which ye both learned and received and heard and saw in me, these things do," he told his Philippian church.[30] The Thessalonians he tactfully admonished: "As ye received of us how ye ought to walk and to please God, even as ye do walk,—that ye abound more and more."[31] Sharply defined rules for conduct were essential. Logically, of course, they were unnecessary. He who was in Christ would have supplied by the Spirit all necessary insight and help, but logic in Paul always gave way to the practical needs of morality. He saw to his sorrow that many claimed to be in Christ and yet failed to live worthily of the Gospel of Christ.

---

and likeness had to give way, although the apostles still continued to urge both in their epistles, and to hold up the mind, the labours, and the sufferings as an example. In the early church the imitation of Christ never became a formal principle of ethics (to use a modern phrase) except for the virtuoso in religion, the ecclesiastic, the teacher, the apostle, or the martyr; it played quite a subordinate part in the ethical teaching of the church. Even the injunction to be like Christ, in the strict sense of the term, occurs with comparative rarity."—*The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, i, p. 107, n. 1.

[30] Phil. 4:9. With this should be compared the emphasis Seneca laid on choosing some example:

" 'Some man of noble character is to be cherished and ever held before our eyes that we may live as if he were watching, and act as if he beheld all we did' . . . Therefore choose a Cato; if he seems too severe a model, choose a man of gentler spirit, a Lælius. Choose one whose life and speech and soul-revealing face delight you. Ever picture him to yourself as guardian or model. I assure you, we must have some one by whom we may check our characters. You can never straighten what is bent save with a ruler."—*Ep. Mor.*, 11, 8–10 (the quotation is from a word of Epicurus, *Fgm.* 210 Usener). A similar word occurs in *Ep. Mor.* 25, 5–6.

[31] I Thes. 4:1; cf. also Rom. 16:17.

In the matter of forgiveness Paul urges, "Even as the Lord forgave you, so also do ye."[32] Christlikeness was the ideal, but was not attained by imitation, but by entering on a new life. Here we must briefly consider one of the most difficult problems in Paul. We are confronted with many passages contrasting flesh with spirit and the old man with the new man. On an Orphic tablet found in southern Italy is an inscription to the effect: "I am a child of earth and the starry heaven, but my race is from heaven."[33] It is to a type of thought illustrated by passages such as this and not to Paul's Jewish heritage that we must look to understand phrases like: "Who mind earthly things"; "Set your mind on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth"; "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second man is of heaven."[34] For the Jew the body was by no means evil. Flesh in the Old Testament is transitory but never evil; nor is it specifically the seat of sin.[35] For the Greek the body was the prison house in which the soul was doomed. Plotinus is said to have felt ashamed he had a body. All this was alien to the Jew. His psychology was very simple. His body was an integral part of him; life without the body was inconceivable. The *ruaḥ* or animating principle or breath was breathed into the body and it became a *nephesh* or individual. The *ruaḥ* was thus substance, the *nephesh* the resulting entity. At death the *ruaḥ* left the body and the *nephesh* was automatically dissolved. The Hebrew did not conceive of an individual soul being contained *in* the body, but of breath making the body—itself a vital part of the person—a living soul (nephesh).[36] Thus the idea of the soul being able to continue any real existence apart from the body was to him impossible. To be sure, this perfectly self-consistent theory was modified, due to the influence of other nations with whom he came in contact, and some adaptation had to be made, but actually these other views were never completely assimilated, and the original view of ancient Israel persisted.

---

[32] Col. 3:13; cf. Eph. 4:32.

[33] Kaibel, *Inscriptiones Graecae Sicilae et Italiae*, No. 638.

[34] Phil. 3:19; Col. 3:2; I Cor. 15:47. With them should be compared Philo's contrast between *ὁ οὐράνιος ἄνθρωπος* and *ὁ γήϊνος*.—*Leg. Alleg.* i, 12 (§31) 49M.

[35] The familiar parable of the two keepers set over the garden reveals clearly the Jewish attitude. Sin is the sin of the whole man, not of either constituent part. For the parable see G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i, pp. 487 f.: ii, p. 384.

The Greek view was different. The Orphics and Pythagoreans had been the first to grasp the meaning of the dualism of flesh and spirit. Plato and the later schools developed this view of man's dual nature until a distrust of the flesh was shared to a greater or less degree by the philosophers of almost every school. Seneca could remark without affectation:

> I am a higher being (*maior*) and born for higher things than to be a slave of my body, which I look upon as only a shackle (*vinclum*) put upon my freedom. . . In so detestable (*obnoxio*) a habitation dwells the free soul.[37]

---

[36] The words of the author of Wisdom of Solomon 8:19 f.,

παῖς δὲ ἤμην εὐφυής, ψυχῆς τε ἔλαχον ἀγαθῆς,
μᾶλλον δὲ ἀγαθὸς ὢν ἦλθον εἰς σῶμα ἀμίαντον,—

"I was a well-bred child and gained a good soul; or rather, since I was good (*i.e.*, a good soul), I came into an undefiled body"—do not invalidate this statement, but reveal his Greek environment.

[37] *Ep. Mor.* 65, 20 f.

The oft-repeated phrase of M. Aurelius, which he attributes to Epictetus, well illustrates this teaching "Thou art a poor soul burdened with a corpse"[38]—a sentiment which would have been completely unintelligible to an unsophisticated Jew.[39]

That Paul was influenced by this Greek dualism is evident; to what extent constitutes a problem over the solution of which scholars disagree, and with reason, for Paul is not explicit. But the probable clue to his view is to see that his dualism—while actual—is ethical rather than metaphysical or physiological. He is not concerned as were Plato and Seneca and Plutarch in arguing that true blessedness is realized only by getting rid of the body. Paul is too good a Jew for that; the body was an essential part of the man as his insistence on belief in the resurrection of the body of believers and the future spiritual body makes clear. He was sufficiently influenced by Greek thought to feel apparently that the body was inferior, must be kept in subjection, and might even be the seat of sin, but not enough to feel it was sin. But his emphasis and interest are best seen in the contrast between "the old man" and "the new man."[40] Before entering into mystical union with the Lord the man is carnal (*σαρκικός*),[41] walks after the flesh (*κατὰ σάρκα*),[42] minds the things of the flesh,[43] and does the works of the flesh.[44] Paul calls this phase of existence before the start of the new life the old man (*τὸν πάλαιον ἄνθρωπον*),[45] and characterizes him as waxing corrupt after the lusts of deceit.[46] But by baptism he becomes united with Christ (cf. Rom. 6:3 ff.); that part of life is over. "I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me"[47] is the central note of the Pauline gospel. Nor was this for Paul alone. It was the experience of all Christians. By baptism they had been consecrated, mystically united with Christ, or, to change the figure, had become a new creation, the old man having died and thus having given place to the new man whose nature it was to live in Christ. Having put off the old man, they should put on the virtues corresponding to the new man,[48] no longer doing the works of the flesh, but bearing the fruits of the spirit.[49]

---

[38] M. Aurel. 4, 41. The saying is not now to be found in the works of Epictetus. The similarity of the words σῶμα and σῆμα was often commented upon. The body was the tomb of the soul. Cf. Plato, *Cratylus* 400BC; *Georgias* 493 A.

[39] In Wisdom of Solomon 9:15 it is said, "For the corruptible body presseth down the soul, and the earthy tabernacle weigheth down the mind that museth upon many things." But see p. 121, n. 36.

[40] For recent attempts to connect Paul's notion of the inner man to the Anthropos tradition see C. H. Kraeling, *Anthropos and Son of Man*, pp. 179 f.

So it is seen that it is the two men who were contrasted: the old man subject to all the appetites and passions of fleshly nature and hopelessly striving to win salvation by keeping a law which was slavery, and the new man through his union with Christ living a new life in Christ and with Christ alive in him. Paul might call the old nature carnal (σαρκικός) and after the flesh κατὰ σάρκα)[50] and the new nature spiritual (πνευματικός), yet his interest was not in the terms themselves, but in the change that had been wrought. The old man lived after the flesh (κατὰ σάρκα); but Paul was careful not to say in the flesh (ἐν σαρκί), for flesh (σάρξ) was the possession of the old and new alike. So he can write: ". . . and that life which I now live in the flesh (ἐν σαρκί) I live in faith, etc."[51]; or again: "For though we walk in the flesh (ἐν σαρκί), we do not war according to the flesh (κατὰ σάρκα)."[52] Nor could it be said that the old man did not have a spirit (πνεῦμα). He had a πνεῦμα but not the right one.[53] It cannot be made too clear that it was ethics that concerned Paul. It was the death of obedience to blind selfish impulse and the birth to the life of obedience to the eternal moral order, to conformity with the eternal will of God, that concerned him. When he exclaimed, "Who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?"[54] he was not expressing a longing to become a disembodied spirit, as would have appealed to Plotinus, but the longing to get rid of the old corrupt, vicious nature, leaving this behind to live the life of a new man who has experienced the power of Christ's resurrection.[55]

---

[41] I Cor. 3:3.
[42] Rom. 8:4.
[43] Rom. 8:5.
[44] Gal. 5:19 ff.
[45] Rom. 6:6; Eph. 4:22; Col. 3:9.
[46] Eph. 4:22.
[47] Gal. 2:20.
[48] Col. 3:1–17; Eph. 2:1–10.
[49] Gal. 5:22 ff. and often.

---

[50] Critics disagree whether or not σάρξ was inherently evil in the eyes of Paul. Burton (*ICC Gal.*, p. 494) remarks (although in its context caution is expressed)" . . . there is a force in man that makes for evil, which he (Paul) calls σάρξ"; C. H. Watkins (*St. Paul's Fight for Galatia*, pp. 91 f.) more definitely: "Paul takes up an attitude toward the 'flesh' which betrays one who is in a high degree a 'spiritual man' (German, *Pneumatiker*; Greek, πνευματικός; cf. I Cor. 2:14, 15) . . . He reveals a great shrinking from, and distaste for, the 'flesh' . . ." On the contrary, T. B. Strong (*H. B. D.*, i, p. 785) writes more cautiously: "St. Paul does not mean . . . that the flesh, as such, is the seat of evil; but it is the material and transient side of man's nature, which has no right to stand as the object of his life."

[51] Gal. 2:20.

[52] II Cor. 10:3.

[53] From I Cor. 2:14; 15:44, 46 it might be felt that Paul would have preferred to have said that the old man possessed a ψυχή rather than a πνεῦμα (cf. Jude 19, ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες), yet in view of such passages as I Cor. 2:12; Eph. 2:2 it is probably unwise to see in Paul that sharp distinction that characterizes the later Gnostics.

The man that had experienced this change of nature had his standard of conduct revealed to him. By identifying himself with Christ he became by virtue of this union as Christ was, and could do and did what Christ did,[56] since Christ was not so much the example to be followed as at once the source of the new life and the power rendering it possible. Accordingly, the admonition, "If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God. Set your mind on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth. For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God,"[57] for to Paul the man who was ἅγιος must inevitably show it; he must bear fruits of the spirit if the spirit be really at work within him.

The case of the *pneumatikoi* at Corinth is instructive. Apparently they had accepted Paul's teaching of freedom from the law and had construed the new life to be one of license. For them there was no criterion of moral conduct; they were "spiritual." That was sufficient. For them all things were lawful. Paul retorts, "All things are lawful for me, but not all things are expedient."[58] Liberty was not to be license. The most scrupulous purity of moral conduct was essential. A true criterion was necessary. It could no longer be the law, for the Christians had been emancipated from its bondage. Paul would have been as ready to agree with them on this point as he was to attack the errorists at Colossæ with their demands: "Handle not, nor taste, nor touch."[59] They were not to determine their conduct by such fleshly ordinances; nevertheless, they were to realize that there were higher constraints, such as love and forbearance, from which no man could ever be free—or rather, by the keeping of which man could alone be free. In so far as those men who claimed arrogantly alone to be *spiritual* because of their ability to speak in tongues scorned the other Christians and refused to heed the principles of unselfishness and to seek to aid the brother for whom Christ had died, they revealed the hollowness of their claim. Instead of being spiritual their conduct showed them to be wholly given up to the flesh.[60] It was this pragmatic test that counted for Paul. By their fruits would they be known. Professing faith, even having become ἅγιος through baptism would not avail unless this faith was actually a new life which revealed itself in conduct.

---

[54] Rom. 7:24.

[55] This discussion is not to be construed as a denial that Paul was familiar with the dualism of Hellenistic thought. It cannot be emphasized too often that Paul was not a philosopher, and was not particularly at home in abstract speculation. The absence of any definite term to be set in contrast to σάρξ (cf. Lietzmann's excellent excursus, "Das Fleisch und die Sünde," on Rom. 7:14) reveals the difference in his approach from, for example, Philo.

[56] Cf. Eph. 4:15.

[57] Col. 3:1–3.

---

[58] I Cor. 6:12. This twice-repeated πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν (all things are lawful for me) probably represents an antinomian saying such as πάντα ἔξεστιν (cf. also "meats for the belly, and the belly for meats") of the *pneumatikoi* at Corinth. It was Paul's wont to take his opponents' phrases and turn them back on the speakers. Others consider it a catchword which had been uttered by Paul against Jewish protagonists for the law and which his opponents have now turned back against him. For still another possibility see J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, in loc.

[59] Col. 2:21.

So really the ultimate ideal for Christian conduct became that which promoted true κοινωνία (fellowship), with the Lord and, which was but another way of saying the same thing, with the brethren. Christ dwelt in them; they actually formed his body,[61] or with a slight change in the figure, they were different members making up a body whose head was Christ.[62] They must live in a manner worthy of this exalted state. Dissension and discord among them were against Christ;[63] against the common life circulating through all as blood through the various members of the human body, for this Christian group continued the life of Christ. Gal. 5:13 makes very clear that to Paul the effectual way to guard against letting liberty degenerate into license was continuously to render services to one another. Cease this, and not only would the body of believers fall apart, but the connection of the individual Christian with his Lord would also be sundered.

[60] I Cor. 3:1, 3. Here both epithets, σαρκικοί and σάρκινοι, are used. It would seem hypercritical to detect any essential difference between them. In a preceding verse (2:14; cf. also 15:44, 46; Jas. 3:15; Jude 19) ψυχικός is used in the same sense. Cf. p. 124, n. 53.

[61] I Cor. 12:27; Eph. 1:23.

[62] Eph. 4:11–16; Col. 1:18, 24; 2:19. Had Paul had such "aversion," "disdain," "weariness" of the body as some writers maintain, it is hardly probable that he would have selected this most intimate figure of the relation of the believer to his Lord.

[63] I Cor. 8:12.

In Rom. 12:10 the most affectionate and intimate term is used to describe the spirit that should characterize Christian to Christian: "In love of the brethren be tenderly affectioned one to another." φιλόστοργοι (occurring only here in the New Testament, although not unknown in non-biblical writers) expresses the reciprocal and tender affection of parent and child, husband and wife.[64] This family relationship between Christians is to be preserved. Any act that destroys this bond is wrong and to be avoided. Accordingly, bearing the burden of the brother,[65] seeking the others' good and not one's own,[66] seeking to please (but not as "men-pleasers") the neighbor,[67] seeking to build each other up[68]—these were at once Christian duties and the test of the reality of their faith. No better picture of the Pauline ideal could be asked than that found in Phil. 2:1–4.

> Live in unity among yourselves, animated by an equal and mutual love, knit together in all your sympathies and affections, united in all your thoughts and aims. Do nothing to promote the ends of party faction, nothing to gratify your own personal vanity: but be humbled-minded and esteem your neighbours more highly

---

[64] Cf. Fritzsche, *Commentary on Romans* in loc. for an excellent discussion of the word.

[65] Gal. 6:2; Rom. 15:1a.

[66] Rom. 15:1b; Phil. 2:4; I Cor. 10:24.

[67] Rom. 15:2 ff.

[68] Rom. 14:19; 15:2; I Cor. 8:1; 10:23; 14:3 *et pass.*; II Cor. 10:8; 12:19; 13:10; I Thes. 5:11. In the last passage an interesting question arises. The usual pointing is εἶς τὸν ἕνα. Frame (*ICC* in loc.) quotes Lillie's observation that "no edition has εἰς τὸν ἕνα, the construction adopted by Faber Stapulensis (*ad unum usque*, to a man), Whitby (*into one body*), Rückert (who understands by τὸν ἕνα Christ)." Whitby's suggestion is fascinating and completely in accord with the apostle's fundamental thought.

than yourselves. Let not every man regard his own wants, his own interests; but let him consult also the interests and the wants of others.[69]

These passages could be multiplied indefinitely. It would well repay the student of Paul to reread the epistles with an eye to Paul's insistence on the "solidarity" of man, the joint interest binding humanity—and particularly Christians—together. It is often surprising to discover that the emphasis long recognized in Ephesians and Colossians is just as real in Galatians, Corinthians, and Romans.[70] Almost every moral precept is based on its effect on the brethren. The social virtues—love, harmony, service—are never forgotten. In so far as conduct squares with their demand it fulfills the law of Christ,[71] "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,"[72] for the man whose life is thus directed must needs have cast aside the works of the flesh and have brought forth the fruit of the spirit which is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, self-control.[73] Such would indeed make the individual Christian a worthy member of this mystic body whose head is Christ. The law of the Spirit makes men one; it is only the law in their members that makes them many.

---

[69] Lightfoot's admirable paraphrase, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, in loc.

[70] Nor should this fact be overlooked in considering the genuineness of Ephesians and Colossians.

[71] Gal. 6:2.

[72] Gal. 5:14; Lev. 19:18.

[73] Gal. 5:22.

[illegible] page

Many guides and criteria for conduct there were—specific ills must be checked by specific precepts and admonitions—but all resulted from the attempt to answer the fundamental question, What sort of conduct is worthy of a man in Christ? Nor can it be denied that underlying even this standard was another. How could Paul be sure of what was worthy of Christ? For Paul as for every other moral teacher who has made any real impress, the final authority was the light within. The standards he set were his own standards of conduct. We can see how he had come to possess them, but as he wrote he was unconcerned with their genesis. The sort of conduct in which the Corinthians were indulging and which in Paul's eyes disgraced Christ and debauched him whose body the Christians were was the conduct that Paul himself loathed. Can there be a more ultimate authority?

PART II

The Ethics of Paul

SECTION II

Moral Precepts

Chapter VIII—Separate Yourselves from All That Would Defile

SINS OF LUST

At this point in our investigation a very brief résumé may not be out of place. We have seen that the central place Paul gave to morality, and the resultant need of standards which would serve as guides to himself and his fellow Christians in their endeavor to live worthily of the gospel, spring from his conviction of mystic union of the believer with the Lord. The ultimate criterion was to be found in Christ, not alone as the example but as the dynamic source of the new life to which the Christian had arisen. Accordingly, it was only in this mystic union with the risen Lord that the Christian found his freedom from sin possible. The mystic *koinonia* expressed by the formula "in Christ" involved also the *koinonia* between Christians so consecrated. The vertical bond of union with the Lord resulted in just as real a horizontal unity among the fellow believers. Only in so far as this latter fellowship was in the most perfect harmony and peace could the former be realized, since the group was united to the Lord by as real tie as was the individual member, was the body of which Christ was the head, the bride of which he was the husband, the building in which he was the corner stone.

It remains for us to consider how these principles worked out in practice; to see how Paul met specific

Worked out in practice

needs; to study the precepts and advice he gave; to see how they agree and are illustrated by the contemporary ethical systems of the Jews and the Stoics, and to what extent they are divergent. It must ever be remembered that for Paul morality and religion were inseparable since God was the God of morality, and that religion was life. As a result his morality was essentially practical. Theoretic ethics did not concern him. Practical problems of conduct, affecting the personal life of his converts and their relationships with one another and with non-Christians, were the things about which he wrote and thought.

At the risk of repetition it must be again reminded that the Christians were ἅγιοι—that is, they had been consecrated, set apart for Christ. This implied separateness from those not in this mystic bond. The *mystæ* of the Oriental mystery cults were separate, but with them the distinguishing feature was that they and they alone would gain the blissful immortality through their union with the redeemer-god. But there is not the slightest hint that this consecration demanded a separateness in this life or an avoidance of deeds of conduct other than those ceremonially forbidden, for, as we have seen, they were entirely unconcerned with morals. The distinctiveness that resulted from their consecration was due to the fact that they alone had obtained salvation and light. For Paul the consecration of the Christian involved a separateness from all that would defile:

> For this is the will of God, even your sanctification, that ye abstain from fornication; that each one of you know how to possess himself of his own vessel in sanctification and honor, not in the passion of lust, even as the Gentiles who know not God. . . .[1]

They had come out of the darkness; they must walk in a fitting manner. They had died to the old life; they must evidence a rigid separation from all that pertained to this old life in which they had once walked, for now their life was hid with Christ in God.[2] There was thus a very sharp line of cleavage between the Christian and the heathen world. Separation from heathenism with all its vices was imperative. In this connection the phrase, "Not as the Gentiles do,"[3] is significant. The vices of the heathen world must be absolutely avoided.

Lurid pictures of the depravity and immorality of the heathen world in the days of early Christianity are common. There can be little question that Paul has contributed to this view. His stinging phrase, "Even as the Gentiles,"[4] is always associated with some particularly censurable breach of morality. In speaking to the Gentile Christians Paul unaffectedly refers to the evil ways in which they had walked[5] "according to the course of this age." To be sure, in the next verse he makes the statement more general, yet ends "even as the rest," thus taking Gentile depravity for granted.[6]

[1] I Thes. 4:3–5.

[2] Col. 3:3.

[3] Eph. 4:17.

[4] I Thes. 4:5; cf. I Cor. 5:1; Gal. 2:15.

[5] Eph. 2:1 ff.

[6] In the phrase "and were by nature children of wrath" (τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς—Eph. 2:3) some see original sin implied by φύσει; others are content to translate it "naturally." Whatever it means, it would seem to indicate the utter hopelessness of those who were not in Christ.

He reminds them that they had been alien from the commonwealth of Israel and had been despised even by the men who mutilated their own bodies as a special sign. Since the golden age for the Gentile was in the past, their state was truly tragic; they had "lords many" yet actually they were ἄθεοι,[7] a term that recalls the boast of the devotees of the Eleusinian rites to be ἔνθεοι.

However Eph. 5:6 ff. is to be interpreted, it contributes to the gloomy picture of heathenism. For even if, as Abbott (following Harless and Bullinger) maintains,[8] the warning is not against the unbelieving heathen but against their own number who are sexually lax and have low standards, it certainly gives a sidelight on the state of morality in (partially) enlightened communities, and may well explain Paul's insistence in all his writings that this evil be combatted. The terrible arraignment of heathen vice in the first chapter of Romans is echoed in the almost pathetic utterance of the apostle that the only way to get free from fornication and the covetous and idolaters was to go out of the world.[9]

Nor was Paul the only one to bring these charges. Philo[10] would seem to suggest that it was the ordinary thing at dinner parties for the guests to bite one another's ears off or blacken their eyes. Of course this may have been confined to the smart set, or Philo may have preserved some particular scandal as if it were typical, yet it is always to be remembered that Augustine[11] says his mother, Monica, was a *rara avis* among her circle of intimates because she never had bruises on her face; while Seneca[12] gives a gloomy picture of the vice and depravity of life in Rome and concludes with the remarkable sentence:

---

[7] Eph. 2:11 f.

[8] *ICC Eph.*, in loc.

[9] I Cor. 5:9–10.

[10] *de Vit. Contemp.* 5 (§40) 477M.

> If you want the wise man to be as angry as the atrocity of men's crimes requires, he must not merely be angry, but must go mad with rage.[13]

Yet it is easy to overpaint the picture, particularly under the influence of Christian apologetics. It must always be remembered that the censorship is far more strict today than when Martial wrote. To cull a salacious passage from Persius and another from Horace or Martial and to piece them together as if they gave a fair sample of moral conditions gives a wholly distorted picture. Much which we have of this nature is the work of scandalmongers who liked to tell dirty stories or else the work of men who were admittedly satirizing, and were thus intentionally selecting the most reprehensible incidents. Dio Cassius, to whom we owe many of the scandalous stories, was a most malignant historian who delighted in reporting—and perhaps believed—every scandal he could lay his hands upon. Both he[14] and Capitolinus,[15] for example, accused Faustina, the wife of M. Aurelius, of infidelity to her husband and of every type of lewdness. Yet the emperor loved his wife and said she was "obedient, affectionate, and simple."[16] To be sure, Capitolinus[17] remarked that Aurelius either did not know of her actions or pretended ignorance. But the history of imperial Rome is full of stories like these. The same tale is told of the wife of Antoninus Pius, yet he too seemed quite satisfied with his wife, and after her death remarked in a letter to Fronto that he would rather have lived in exile with his wife than in his palace in Rome without her. Knowing the habit of such historians, we should not be too hasty in accepting their stories without the proverbial grain of salt. It is even possible that some of the Christian writers—Jerome notably—became somewhat morbid on the subject, and repeated occasional stories for the sake of repeating them.

---

[11] *Conf.* ix, 9.

[12] *de Ira* 2, 8 and 9—a passage well worth study.

[13] *Ibid.* 2, 9, 4.

[14] *Hist. Rom.* lxxii, 22 and 29.

[15] *Script. Hist. August.*, *Marcus Antoninus* xix, 1–9; xxiii, 7.

But in spite of all allowances the judgment of Cumont is sound: "The laxity of morals at the beginning of our era has been exaggerated but it was real."[18] Paul's gloomy picture was justified at least in the circle in which he worked. Dio Chrysostom[19] records that Tarsus was notorious for the prevalence of pæderasty, while in Corinth the worst of eastern and western civilization seem to have been united. The repulsion and disgust which Paul felt at their vices, the feeling of horror and anger as he saw the ravages they were making even among his converts, may well have deepened the conviction of his boyhood that they were signs of the wrath of God being visited upon the Gentiles for their unfaithfulness, and that now the only possible course for one consecrated to Christ was to separate himself and no longer to live as the Gentiles did.

---

[16] I, 17 (§7).

[17] *Op. cit.*, xxvi, 5.

[18] Cumont, *Oriental Religions*, p. 42; cf. von Dobschütz, *Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, pp. 133–137.

[19] *Orat.* xxxiii, pp. 14 ff. R.

In the discussion of Judaism it was mentioned[20] that in the eyes of the Jew there were three cardinal sins
1 which might never be committed: the recognition of
2 heathenism, the shedding of blood, and the forms of
3 unnatural vice forbidden in Lev. 18. In I Cor. 10:14 Paul exhorts his readers, "Wherefore, my beloved, flee from idolatry," a warning against precisely the first of these three Jewish cardinal sins. εἰδωλολατρία the equivalent of the Hebrew, עבודה זרה,[21] signifies more than our term idolatry, just as εἴδωλον means more than the English idol. It was the recognition of heathenism as such, the alien religion and the alien god, as well as the worship of the god or the worship of his image. This for a Jew was an abomination. For him Deut. 4:35 was gospel: "Jehovah he is God; there is none else beside him." All the terms of abuse and nothingness in the Hebrew tongue are directed against the idols and false gods. In Isa. 40:18–20[22] a sarcastic picture is given of

---

[20] P. 9, n. 24.

[21] "The worship or acknowledgment, express or constructive, of any deity except the one true God, tokens of respect to images, and all the customs associated with heathen religions, public or domestic."—G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i, p. 466.

[22] Also Isa. 44:9–20; 45:20; 46:5–7; Jer. 10:1–16.

the workman making himself a god. In fact, every true Jew took a particular delight in ridiculing the idolater, especially the Egyptian with his worship of unclean and creeping animals.[23] With this attitude Paul was in hearty agreement.[24] The Christian's allegiance was to the only true God; his consecration was to Christ; he must scrupulously separate himself from contact with all the demons of the heathen world. That Paul believed there were numberless evil supernatural beings as well as beneficent ones can hardly be questioned. At times his argument is completely incomprehensible if this be denied.

The Oxyrhynchus Papyri 110 and 523[25] of the second century of our era, which preserve two invitations to dine with the lord Serapis in his temple, shed some light on the episode of I Cor. 10, and make it extremely probable that such feasts, apparently of a ceremonial rather than a private nature, were not uncommon through the Hellenistic world at the time of Paul, and constituted a serious problem for the apostle.[26] The famous experience of Paulina in the temple of Isis recorded by Josephus[27] suggests that meals with the lord Anubis were also common, since Paulina was invited to sup with the god in the temple and was not assaulted until after the meal.

---

[23] Cf. Wisdom of Solomon 13–15.

[24] Cf. the sting in Rom. 1:23. With this verse a word of Seneca in his lost work, *Contra Superstitiones* (quoted by Augustine, *de Civ. Dei* vi, 10), is to be compared: "They dedicate images of the sacred and inviolable immortals in the most worthless and motionless matter. They give them the appearance of man, beasts, and fish, and some make them of mixed sex and heterogeneous bodies. They call them deities, when they are such that if they should get breath and should suddenly meet them, they would be held to be monsters.

[25] *P. Oxy.* 110 Ἐρωτᾷ σε Χαρρήμων δειπνῆσαι εἰς κλείνην τοῦ κυρίου Σαράπιδος ἐν τῷ Σαραπείῳ αὔριον ἥτις ἐστὶν ιέ ἀπὸ ὥρας θʹ. *P. Oxy.* 523 Ἐρωτᾷ σε Ἀντώνιος Πτολεμαίου διπνῆσαι παρ' αὐτῷ εἰς κλείνην τοῦ Σαράπιδος ἐν τοῖς Κλαυδίου Σαραπίωνος τῇ ιϛʹ ἀπὸ ὥρας θʹ.

[26] For an excellent discussion of these feasts, see Lietzmann's excursus, "Kultmahle" in his commentary on I Cor. (pp. 50 f.).

In I Cor. 10 the question was not that of eating meat which had been formally offered to an idol, but was of an entirely different nature. In the former case Paul had advised the Christians not to eat meat if they knew it had been so offered, not because it had received any taint, but because their action might cast a stumbling-block in the path of some less mature Christian and cause him to follow their example even though his conscience warned him.[28] But heathen feasts (usually held in the heathen temple and with the divinity concerned as host) were of an entirely different character. In the private meal it had not been necessary to ask about the meat; if the information was volunteered, it was wiser to leave the meat alone and so not give a bad impression; about the formal sacrificial feast there could be no question. Christians must flee from it.

Paul's argument is instructive. The cup and the bread bring the partakers into relationship with the body and blood of Christ; this participation is the effective force bringing about their union with the Lord. By drinking the cup of blessing they come to participate in the death of Christ, the means of salvation, for blood here signifies his death rather than his risen life. That Paul felt that Christians drank the blood and ate the body of their Lord as the heathen ate the body of their divinity cannot be proved and is perhaps improbable, but Toussaint is fundamentally right when he insists:

---

[27] *Antt.* 18, 3, 4.

[28] See further pp. 245 ff.

> The *κοινωνία* which results from eating the eucharistic bread or from drinking of the Lord's cup is not alone the moral unity of the faithful, but a direct and personal union of the communicant with Christ. . . .[29]

This, Paul points out, is true of every similar sacrificial meal. Since the Jews ate sacrificial meals in connection with the religious act on their altar, actually the worshiper participated with the altar[30] in the sacrifice. Then Paul turns to the application. "This is true in the case of the idolatrous meal. I am not saying that idols and meat offered to idols are anything—of course demons exist, but for us there is but one true God and demons and the like are nothing—yet sharing a feast offered to these demons (though the idol is of no account) brings you into as direct relation with the evil demon as eating the eucharist brings you into relation with Christ. Instead of being ἐν Χριστῷ you become ἐν δαιμονίῳ. The two are mutually exclusive; you cannot participate in both. So as Christians flee from idolatry." Or again in a different connection: Christians were the temples of God;[31] "What agreement hath a temple of God with idols?"[32] The two were completely disparate. When they turned to the living God they turned their backs forever on idols.[33] In their new state of consecration to Christ they must keep themselves entirely separate from that old taint, and must realize that no idolater could be an heir of the kingdom of God.[34]

---

[29] *L'hellénisme et l'apôtre Paul*, p. 317. For a recent discussion of the origin and nature of the Christian meal, see L. Coulange, *La Messe* (1927).

[30] J. Weiss (*Der erste Korintherbrief*, in loc.) gives a slightly different explanation of the puzzling *κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου*, *viz.*, "They come into such close contact and communion with the altar that its sanctity in a manner passes over to them." Lietzmann (*Handb.*, in loc.) cites an interesting passage from Philo (*de Spec. Legg.* i, 8 (§221) 245 M) in which the latter says that since God is beneficent and bounteous he "makes the whole company of those who offer the sacrifice sharer of the altar (*κοινωνὸν . . . τοῦ βωμοῦ*)." From this Lietzmann concludes, " 'Sharers of the altar' accordingly appears to have been a customary formula in Hellenistic Judaism. The fact that it was contained in the formula itself explains the choice of the word *θυσιαστήριον*—which cannot be explained from the Pauline context—instead of 'God' as the parallelism would demand."

Idolatry and sexual impurity were very closely connected. "Most idolaters are adulterers."[35] In the Wisdom of Solomon it is said:

> For the devising of idols was the beginning of fornication, and the invention of them the corruption of life.[36]

In Paul's letters it is significant that in the lists of vices to be shunned idolatry and sexual impurity go hand in hand.[37] In the first chapter of Romans Paul says that it was because of their idolatry that God had given the heathen over to the vilest passions of immorality and vice. In the Old Testament idolatry was regularly depicted as the adulterous abandonment of God by his people Israel. The marital relation is stressed. Israel is the wife (so Hosea) or the bride (so Jeremiah) of Jehovah. From her infidelity all manners of vice and oppression and untruthfulness proceed. It is in complete accord with this view that Paul writes:

---

[31] I Cor. 3:16; 6:19; II Cor. 6:16b.

[32] II Cor. 6:16a.

[33] Cf. I Thes. 1:9.

[34] I Cor. 6:9; Eph. 5:5.

[35] Ketubot 11b.

[36] 14:12, 27.

[37] In the catalogue of I Cor. 6:9 idolaters are preceded by fornicators and followed by three other classes of those guilty of sexual sins; cf. also 10:7, 8.

> Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of an image of corruptible man, and of birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God gave them up in the lusts of their hearts unto uncleanness, that their bodies should be dishonored among themselves: for that they exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen. For this cause God gave them up unto vile passions. . . .[38]

The fight against sexual impurity was one of the most bitter the apostle was called to make. In many of the cults of the Oriental world the sexual life and religion were closely associated. Even in the more respectable of the cults, though not a part of the ritual, yet the wildest of orgies with drunkenness and the utmost abandon often accompanied the ceremonies. To all this the Gentile Christian was accustomed, and was disposed to regard such excesses very leniently if indeed he was not indisposed to indulge in them himself. For example, unchastity in an *unmarried* daughter was a grievous wrong against her family, since it had the tendency to make her marital chances poorer, but aside from that it carried no particular disgrace. Against all this Paul set his face resolutely. The Christian was consecrated to Christ, set apart to a God whose essence was purity, and therefore must separate himself from these corruptions that had come as the awful result of the heathen abandonment of the one true God. In the catalogue of vices, those connected with the sexual relation are the first to be condemned; incest and adultery and fornication along with idolatry regularly receive the initial attack.[39]

---

[38] Rom. 1:22–26a.

Pæderasty has been often referred to as the scourge of the ancient world. Historians of ethics as well as writers on the conditions in the ancient world constantly make mention of the ravages this vice made.[40] To the Jew it was an especial abomination which with incest and the other unnatural vices of Lev. 18 comprised *araiyot*, the third of the cardinal sins.

In the Hebrew law, while the adulteress was stoned to death by the whole community, no legal penalty is attached to the numerous varieties of incest. The ominous sentence is "That person will be cut off from his people"—exterminated by an act of God. The impersonality of the expression suggests a survival of the primitive

---

[39] Rom. 1:26 ff.; I Cor. 6:9 ff.; Gal. 5:19 ff.; Col. 3:5.

[40] Cf. Lecky, *History of European Morals* (1892) ii, pp. 293 ff.; Döllinger, *Heidenthum und Judenthum*, pp. 684–691, 718–720 [E. T., ii, pp. 238–244, 273–275]; Maury, *Histoire des Religions de la Grèce antique*, iii, pp. 35–39; Westermarck, *The Origin and Development of the Moral Idea*, ii, pp. 456–489; Hermann, *Lehrbuch der griech. Privataltertümer*^{3} § 29, pp. 251–260; Bernhardy, *Griech. Lit.*^{5}, pp. 59–62; W. A. Becker, *Charikles* (ed. 1877), ii, pp. 252–285. In the English translation by F. Metcalfe of this last highly important study of Greek life this section on homosexual love is omitted, while the excursus on the hetæræ is (probably unwisely) decidedly abridged.

> conception of the automatic deadly effect of the infringement of the sex tabu.[41]

The early dread of these offenses continued for the Jew, although in later days the death penalty was inflicted.

When Paul gives the terrible arraignment of heathenism in Rom. 1, it is against the unnatural sexual sins that he begins his attack. Just as they had exchanged the truth of God for a lie and had worshiped idols, so now in the degradation to which they had sunk they exchanged the normal intercourse that animals indulge in for that actually contrary to nature. Paul chooses his words carefully here to bring out the bestiality of their condition. Not satisfied with illicit intercourse, the females burn for other females; the males for males. The indictment, "for their women changed their natural use into that which is against nature (*παρὰ φύσιν*),"[42] from its parallelism with the next verse seems a clear reference not to female masturbation nor pæderasty, but to tribadism[43] which we know from occasional satires of Martial and the writings of Lucian was by no means an uncommon pagan sin.[44] Similarly the males are consumed with homosexual love and go to all excesses, with the result that they reap the terrible reward of their degradation.[45]

---

[41] G. F. Moore, *Birth and Growth of Religion*, p. 73. Cf. also S. Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, pp. 224 f.

[42] Rom. 1:26. For the term *παρὰ φύσιν* in this connection see Plutarch, *Amat.* 5, p. 751D (*ἡ παρὰ φύσιν ὁμιλία πρὸς ἄρρενας*); Athenæus, *Deipn.* xiii, 84, p. 605d (*οἱ παρὰ φύσιν τῇ Ἀφροδίτῃ χρώμενοι*); Clement Al., *Paed.* iii, 3-Migne viii, 584C (*καὶ γυναῖκες ἀνδρίζονται παρὰ φύσιν*).

[43] "Tribadæ dictæ a *τρίβω*, frico, frictrices, sunt quibus ea pars naturæ muliebris, quam clitoridem vocant, in tantam magnitudunem excressit, ut possint illa pro mentula vel ad futuendum vel ad pædicendum uti"—Forberg, *Antonii Panormitæ Hermaphroditus* (1824), p. 345.

[44] *Apoc. Petri* 17. *αἱ δὲ μετ' αὐτῶν γυναῖκες, αὖται ἦσαν αἱ συγκοιμηθεῖσαι ἀλλήλαις ὡς ἂν ἀνὴρ πρὸς γυναῖκα*; cf. also Plato, *Sympos.* 191E; Lucian, *D. Mer.* 5, 1; *Amor.* 28; Phocylidis, *Carmen* 180. Forberg, *op. cit.*, pp. 345–369, and Rosen-

Paul's other reference to this form of sin is in I Cor. 6:9 f., "Be not deceived: neither . . . μαλακοὶ nor ἀρσενοκοῖται . . . shall inherit the kingdom of God." Some confusion has arisen as to the meaning of μαλακός. The uncertainty of the exact meaning of the term is as old as Dionysius of Halicarnassus (30 B.C.), who said that the tyrant Aristodemus had received the epithet either because of his effeminate practices or else because of his gentle disposition.[46] The former of these meanings is probably to be seen in I Cor. 6:9 where the word would thus be equivalent to the Latin *molles*—that is, *qui muliebra patiuntur*—and instead of being a mere redundancy for ἀρσενοκοῖται would be the passive of the latter.[47]

---

baum, *Geschichte der Lustseuche im Alterthum* (1845), p. 143, may also be consulted. Nor was this vice unknown among the Jews, as Schöttgen, *Hor. Hebr. et Talm.* in loc. (i, pp. 492 f.) reveals; cf. Strack und Billerbeck, *Kommentar z. N. T. aus Midr. u. Talmud*, iii, pp. 68 f.

[45] While probably the words, "receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was due" (1:27), are to be understood to mean that degradation is the reward of their blind folly in abandoning the one true God, it is just possible that the customary result of sexual promiscuity was in the apostle's mind, though he never—except perhaps in this veiled verse—refers to it as the wages of sin. That venereal disease was common in those days we know from contemporary authors. For a complete discussion with full apparatus see Rosenbaum, *op. cit.*

[46] vii, 2, p. 1316—εἰθ' ὅτι θηλυδρίας ἐγένετο παῖς ὢν καὶ τὰ γυναιξὶν ἁρμόττυντα ἔπασχεν, ὡς ἱστοροῦσί τινες· εἰθ' ὅτι πρᾷος ἦν φύσει καὶ μαλακὸς εἰς ὀργήν, ὡς ἕτεροι γράφουσιν.

[47] So most recent commentators, including J. Weiss and Lietzmann. Meyer, on the contrary, argues against this meaning on the ground that πόρνοι or κίναιδοι would be the proper term for such, and that μαλακοί must signify "effeminate luxurious livers." But the position of this word among those clearly referring to sexual offenses seems fatal to his view.

In no other point of morals was the contrast between the teachings of Paul and the general habits and opinions of the Roman world more clearly seen than in this attitude toward homosexual love. To be sure, the *Lex Scatinia* of unknown date prescribed a fine to be paid by the offender against a freeman, but this law soon fell into desuetude[48] and little or no attention was paid to the subject by later legislators. Far from concerning themselves with any reform—although Domitian once enforced this law against a group of senators[49]—the emperors themselves set the fashion. Even Trajan and Antoninus appear to have been among the conspicuous offenders.[50] Zeno is reported to have said that it was immaterial whether a man enjoyed intimacies with a boy or restrained himself to intercourse with women,[51] while Athenæus claims that as a matter of fact Zeno never had intercourse with women, but always with beautiful youths.[52] This would appear to be in line with Plutarch's remark that the reputation of the philosophers was such that parents were loath to allow their children to know them.[53] Plutarch himself is quite unwilling to oppose himself to the judgment of Socrates, Plato, Xenophon, Æschines, and Cebes, and so contents himself with a most evasive answer. Occasional protests were raised by moralists.[54] Juvenal bitingly satirizes this phase of city life, but "when Christianity became the religion of the Roman Empire, a veritable crusade was opened against it."[55] It was due to Paul and his successors[56] with their uncompromising morality and hatred of this kind of vice that at a later date Constantius and Constans made it a capital crime.

---

[48] Christius, *Hist. Legis Scatiniae* (1727), pp. 7, 9.

[49] Suet. *Dom.* 8.

[50] Döllinger, *op. cit.*, p. 718 [E. T., ii, p. 274.]

[51] Sext. Emp., xi, 190, p. 724.

[52] *Deipn.* xiii, 15, p. 563e.

[53] *de Educ. Puer.* 15, p. 11D F.

[54] Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* vii, p. 269R.

In I Cor. 5 Paul declares himself in the matter of incest, for that is what *πορνεία*[57] must indicate, since the man had his father's wife (*γυναῖκά τινα τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχειν*).[58] Apparently the woman was the offender's stepmother; whether or not the father was dead is not said.[59] In either case the crime remained. The Jewish law forbade intercourse with one's mother[60] or stepmother[61] on penalty of being stoned to death.[62] According to R. Akiba[63] a proselyte might marry his father's widow; this was not allowed the Jew.

---

[55] Westermark, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 480.

[56] Cf. Ign., *Eph.* 16:1; Polyc., *Phil.* 5:3.

[57] The use of the word *πορνεία* here instead of some technical term for incest makes it probable that there was no such word in Greek. *πορνεία*, though rare in the classics and then usually restircted to "prostitution," was used in the Septuagint of "unlawful sexual intercourse, whether involving violation of marriage or not" (Burton, *ICC Gal.*, p. 305). Cf. also R. H. Charles (*Teachings of the New Testament on Divorce*, 1921, pp. 91–111), who cites numerous illustrations of the use of *πορνεία* and *μοιχεία*. *πορνεία* would thus seem to be the word a translator of גילוי עריות would use.

[58] I Cor. 5:1.

[59] von Dobschütz (*Christian Life in the Primitive Church*, p. 387) argues that the expression *γυναῖκα ἔχειν* proves that the guilty pair were actually married. It should, however, be noted that the word *γυναῖκα* does not refer to the woman's connection to the son, but to her former husband.

[60] Lev. 18:7.

[61] Lev. 18:8; 20:11. Cf. Deut. 22:30; 27:20.

[62] M. Sanhedrin 7, 4 (quoted by Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* I Cor. 5:2).

[63] Maimonides, *Yebamot* 982—Wettstein, in loc.

Nor was the aversion to this vice peculiar to the Jews. Paul's statements that it was "such fornication as is not even among the Gentiles" (v.1) seems completely justified by the evidence. Though the Persians were said by Philo[64] regularly to marry their mothers, this was abhorrent to Greece and Rome. The Roman law was as strict here as it was lax on pæderasty. Marriage between descendants and ancestors—even by adoption—was strictly forbidden. Mommsen[65] states:

> The relation between parents-in-law and children-in-law and between stepparents and stepchildren, as caused by marriage and approximating to filiation, during the existence of the causing marriage, constitutes an aggravation by adding incest to adultery, and remains incest even when the marriage is dissolved.

Sexual intercourse between parties so related, even though without the form of marriage, was also regarded as incest, and was punished as such.[66] Instances occurred, but they were rare in Greece and Rome, and were looked upon with horror, as is seen from the tragedies written about the unwitting sin of Œdipus and the dire results of Phædra's mad love for Hippolytus.

Here in the case of such an offense Paul felt called upon to use extreme measures. His teaching that Christians must keep themselves separate from the sins of the flesh had been openly defied. One of their own number was guilty of a horrid sin, abhorred even by the Gentiles and yet, so far from taking it seriously and

[64] *de Spec. Legg.* iii, 3 (§§ 12–14) 301M.
[65] *Rom. Strafrecht*, p. 685, quoted by von Dobschütz, *op. cit.*, p. 388.
[66] Mommsen, *op. cit.* pp. 687 f.

being ashamed, the members of the Corinthian church—or at least a part—in their "perfectionism," which had resulted from a misinterpretation of the doctrine of freedom, actually seemed proud that as *pneumatikoi* they could break every canon of decency and yet be without sin. The community life was imperiled; no halfway measures were possible. Though this might be an isolated case, yet a little leaven leavens the whole lump.[67] By his life the offender had manifested clearly that his faith was not real; he was not *in Christ*, even though he had been baptized. The church must purge itself from him. The interpretation of verses 3 and 4 is not quite clear; but what Paul apparently says is that he has already, though absent, passed judgment in the name of the Lord upon the offender and that in conformity to his decision the Corinthians are to assemble formally, confident that he is with them in spirit, and pronounce the sentence upon the man, "We deliver you over to Satan."

The words, "for the destruction of the flesh," would seem to exclude the interpretation that this handing over to Satan meant excommunication, for, as Lightfoot[68] has made probable, excommunication, which was to fill up the lacunæ in the law, was by no means a terrible punishment. To be sure, the excommunicate could eat with none save his own family, and could not attend the temple service, yet on the whole his state was far easier than that of the mourner. People could talk with him. He need not shave his head. He could work, bathe, wear sandals, have intercourse with his wife—all of which were forbidden the mourner. Of course with his primary desire to keep the Christian group free from all that savored of the old life in the flesh it may be that Paul's only concern was to free them from the contamination, yet if such was the case the phraseology seems odd, for something more than mere exclusion would seem to be voiced here. The words of the Corinthians, made effective by the power of the Lord Jesus,[69] were to result in the destruction of the man's flesh. A not improbable guess as to what the apostle meant is that at the pronouncement of these ominous[70] words, which were in themselves a public curse charged with magic, the sinner would drop dead. The case of Ananias and Sapphira[71] is quite similar; with this should be compared the account of the blinding of Elymas.[72] The view that sickness, even death itself, resulted from an improper observance of the Lord's Supper is clear from I Cor. 11:30. A point not always considered is to be observed. The phrase, "Put away the wicked man from among yourselves"[73] with which the section closes, is the Deuteronomic death sentence.[74] Even Paul, accustomed as he was to fantastic exegesis and completely indifferent to the context of a convenient quotation, must have been aware of the tradition about these words.

---

[67] I Cor. 5:6.
[68] *Horae Hebr.* in loc.

---

[69] *σῦν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ.*

[70] The only other occurrence of the phrase, "to deliver unto Satan" in the N. T. occurs in I Tim. 1:20. Here death is not demanded, though possibly not excluded, since *παιδευθῶσι* may refer to the loss of life to avoid ultimate destruction at the final judgment—apparently the teaching of I Cor. 5:5. But the whole passage is very obscure. Who is Alexander? Is he to be identified with either the man in Acts 19:33 or II Tim. 4:14?

With Paul's words *παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ* should be compared a pagan execration, *νεκυδαίμων . . . παραδίδωμί σοι τὸν δεῖνα, ὅπως*, which, while preserved in a fourth-century papyrus (*Greek Papyri in the British Museum*, ed. Kenyon, i, p. 75, quoted by Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*^{4}, p. 302, n. 5) is apparently ancient. The only difference between this curse and that of Paul's is that the gods of the lower world replace Satan.

[71] Acts 5:1–11.

[72] Acts 13:11. Among the examples of the curse may be mentioned the destruction of Korah (Numb. 16:31–35), the paralysis of Rufina (*Acta Petri* 2), the miracles wrought by Peter against Simon Magus (*ibid.* 15 and 32), and the death of Fortunatus (*Acta Johannis* 86). Numerous other instances, including

Even for those who see in the penalty simply exclusion from the Christian group with resultant sickness and wasting away, the magical element cannot be eliminated. It is foreign to us today. Paul, however, did not live in the twentieth century. There is no note of intercession for the man or hope for his conversion. He had been guilty of an abomination for which Paul had been taught from his early youth there could be no repentance. He was to be cut off without mercy. Yet the man had been baptized; this had had its effect. Manifestly his faith was not real. He was not actually *in Christ*, was a menace to the community, and must be removed, yet because he was a *saint*, although an unworthy one, eventually he might be saved "in the day of the Lord Jesus."[75] It is difficult to see how Paul could have felt

---

Theseus' curse of Hippolytus (Euripedes, *Hippolytus* 887 ff.), the curse pronounced by the Eumolpidæ upon Alcibiades (Lysias, *Orat.* 6, 51), may be found in von Dobschütz, *op. cit.*, pp. 389–391. Cf. also Lietzmann, *Handb.* in loc.; Deissmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 302 ff.

[73] I Cor. 5:13.

[74] Cf. Deut. 13:5; 17:7, 12; 21:21; 22:21, 22, 24.

[75] For further discussion of this inconsistency in logic see pp. 58; 68, n. 12.

that by excluding this shocking sinner from the Christion fellowship his chance for being saved at the judgment was greatly improved. Is it not rather that Paul felt that efficacious as the baptism into the Lord was it could not offset everything? If this man continued his abominable actions, he might well be without hope. Death alone would prevent further tempting of God's patience.

This should not, however, obscure the fact that Paul was not primarily concerned with the fate of the man. He had shown himself to be outside the Christian fellowship. Paul's purpose was to preserve this group; to make perfectly clear the obligation that their consecration had laid upon them to have nothing to do with the works of the flesh, of which incest was an awful instance.

Fornication, the most common of the sins of sexual impurity, received short shift at the hands of Paul. It was a dreadful sin of the flesh belonging to the dead past. No one who was *in Christ* could any longer be guilty of it. In I Cor. 6:12 ff. he makes very clear the reason for his opposition to a vice looked upon with great leniency by his Gentile converts as one of little moment. Following a short section in the terse style of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, he had again listed the various offenses, foremost among which, as usual, were the sins of sexual impurity, and had concluded with the statement,

> And such were some of you men; but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified [*i.e.* consecrated], but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God.[76]

These three verbs (*ἀπελούσασθε, ἡγιάσθητε, ἐδικαιώθητε*) refer to a religious status, not to an improvement in morals. The washing of baptism did not mean primarily a change in moral character, but an improvement in religious status and in ability to worship God. By *ἡγιάσθητε* he meant that they had been set apart to God, were saints in that sense, had access to higher qualities, but did not necessarily possess them. They had been declared to be in right relations with God, not that they had been of right moral character or had been made such. A proper recognition of this is essential for a proper understanding of Paul's teaching, and has been constantly emphasized in the preceding pages, but the companion truth for Paul must not be obscured, nor can it be repeated too often. Religion and morality were but two phases of the same subject. While the Oriental mysteries stopped with the efficacy of the initiatory rites, Paul maintained that this intimate relationship with the Lord into which the *saint* had entered was of such a nature that a new life of the most scrupulous moral purity was inevitable. It was because of the mystic union of believer and Lord that the sin of fornication was so terrible. This was blinked by some of the converts at Corinth, even as it was by some of the devotees of the other mystery cults. In their eyes unrestrained sexual acts were normal: meat for the belly the belly for meat, a position advocated by certain Cynics of whom Diogenes was a striking example. Even Demosthenes (if he really is the author of the disputed *Against Neæra*) had declared, "Mistresses we keep for pleasure, concubines for the sake of daily intercourse, wives to bear us legitimate children and to be our faithful housekeepers."[77] Against this attitude Paul urged his thesis of mystical union. The believers, saints, were actually joined to Christ; their bodies were no longer their own, but were real members of Christ—or with a slight change of figure they made up Christ's body. Since this was the case, if such a man had intercourse with a prostitute, his act took on the enormous character of actually joining the body of Christ to such a person! No further argument was necessary: "Flee fornication" (v. 18). Yet his horror of such a deed was so strong that with what seems to us an anti-climax he continued that, of all sins, this was the worst, since it defiled the body which was the shrine of the Holy Spirit.[78]

---

[76] I Cor. 6:11.

Of adultery the apostle has little additional to say. The word μοιχεία[79] does not occur, though in the famous passage in Rom. 7:1 ff., comparing the Christian's freedom from the dead law with the wife's freedom from the dead husband, forms of the word μοιχαλίς (adulteress) occur twice. In Rom. 2:22 and 13:9 the Seventh Commandment is quoted, while in I Cor. 6:9 adulterers (μοιχοί) are distinguished from fornicators (πόρνοι). For the most part, however, adultery seems included by such other terms as πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία and the like. For example, in I Thes. 4:3 ff. adultery would seem to be what was forbidden, if, as is probable, σκεῦος ("vessel") is to be interpreted to mean *wife*, an interpretation that receives much support from the frequent use of כלי in that sense in the Rabbinic literature.[80] The satisfaction of the sexual passion was to be found with one's own wife, not in robbing another man of what was rightfully his.

---

[77] *c. Neæra* 122, p. 1386.

[78] His statement that all other sins were "without [*i.e.*, outside] the body" (ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος), v. 18, cannot, of course, be defended, yet emphasizes the point that sexual excess was the chief vice in his eyes.

[79] Apparently the term was regularly restricted to the guilty act of a married woman; the illicit intercourse of a married man and an unmarried woman was not so called. See Charles, *The Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce*, p. 99, n. 1; Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, first series, p.73.

Adultery in a married woman in the eyes of the pagan world was a grievous offense against the rights of the husband. That no single code, however, existed is clear from the statement attributed to M. Cato, the Stoic, by Aulus Gellius:[81]

> If you catch your wife in adultery you may kill her without hesitation and without recourse to law. But if you commit adultery or are forced, she may not lay a finger upon you, nor has she recourse to law.

The property rights of the husband had been outraged. This was later modified by Augustus. For Paul, on the contrary, though he apparently would say that adultery was a kind of theft and so a wrong against the neighbor, the fundamental objection to it was that it was contrary to and subversive of the true nature of the Christian's consecration, and as such contrary to the will of God.[82]

---

[80] See Strack und Billerbeck, *op. cit.* in loc. (iii, pp. 632 f.).

[81] *Noctes Atticæ*, x, 23, 5.

In I Thes. 2:3 we find another reason for Paul's determined opposition to sensuality. In answer to an attack from his enemies he retorted that his teaching did not proceed from error nor from "uncleanness" (ἀκαθαρσία). This word, which, except for Matt. 23:27, occurs only in Paul,[83] would seem, from its constant use in contexts intimating sexual impurity, to be used by Paul to refer specifically to sensuality and impurity of the sexual life. The Gentile churches in Thessalonica and Corinth were fully acquainted with the orgiastic rites of the mystery cults, as, for example, the cult of the Cabiri, which had its center in Thessalonica. It would seem as if here Paul was refuting the charge that the practices of the Christians were no better than those of the heathen cults, and that "the missionaries were no better morally than other itinerant imposters" (Frame), rather than the charge that his motives were selfish (Thayer).

Indeed, one reason for Paul's constant stress on sexual purity was the fear that the Christian group would be confused with sects of a somewhat similar nature which were charged with the foulest indecencies. Scurrilous stories bringing discredit upon the Christian fellowship might be circulated, as indeed they were a little later,[84] while the excitement and emotional extravagances attending the Christian gatherings where both men and women assembled together, often at night, were well calculated to give food for gossip. This motive, which for want of better term may be styled *prophylactic*, is always discernible in Paul's teaching. He well realized the extreme danger that his teaching of freedom involved. Laxity in matters sexual was the order of the day. If now the impression became circulated that the Christians were above all law and hence nothing they did was sinful—an attitude apparently taken by the *pneumatikoi* at Corinth—a riot of sexual excess was certain. Against this danger Paul waged his battle. "For God called us not for uncleanness, but in sanctification,"[85] was his revolutionary challenge. Today it is fairly obvious to the great majoriry of the Christian world that religion and impurity are disparate. This fact obscures the pioneer work of Paul. When he preached in Thessalonica and Corinth it was not obvious. Paul's insistence that God was a God of purity and morality, that even to mention the vices of the old life was unbecoming a saint,[86] that impure conduct (αἰσχρότης) and impure speech (εὐτραπελία) were so far from fitting the saint that those guilty of them could never inherit the kingdom of Christ and of God;[87] all this shows how completely Paul infused his moral teaching into a religious form in itself completely unmoral.

---

[82] I Thes. 4:3 f.

[83] Rom. 1:24; 6:19; I Cor. 12:21; Gal. 5:19; Eph. 4:19; 5:3; Col. 3:5; I Thes. 2:3; 4:7.

---

[84] The refutation of these charges, particularly of Thyestian banquets and Œdipean nuptials, was the constant work of the apologists; cf. Athenagoras, *Supplic.* 31–36; Aristides, *Apol.* 17, 2; Justin M., *Apol.* i, 26, 7; ii, 12, 2; etc.

[85] I Thes. 4:7.

[86] Eph. 5:3.

That the Stoics felt an abhorrence for loose and vulgar speech and sensed its unfitness for the wise man is seen from Epictetus, whose words serve as a commentary for Paul:

> Avoid raising men's laughter (cf. *εὐτραπελία* in Paul); for it is a habit that easily slips into vulgarity, and it may well suffice to lessen your neighbor's respect. It is dangerous to lapse into foul language (*εἰς αἰσχρολογίαν*); when anything of the kind occurs, rebuke the offender, if the occasion allows, and if not, at least make plain to him by your silence, blush, and frown that you are displeased at such talk.[88]

In a similar strain Seneca writes:

> In the first rank I number those who devote themselves to nothing save drinking and debauchery, for none are busied in more shameful practices. Others, even though they pursue a glory which is but counterfeit, have at least a plausible reason for going astray. Though you tell me of misers, of men given to wrath, of those who hate, of those who wage war unjustly, all such sin as men. But the sin of those who are given up to gluttony and lust is disgraceful.[89]

Incontinentia, Aulus Gellius tells us, as has already been noted,[90] was one of the two cardinal sins in the eyes of Epictetus which were specifically referred to by his famous saying, "Bear and forbear." With Paul's description of the enemies of the cross of Christ, "whose God is the belly, and whose glory is in their shame,"[91] should be compared the remark of Seneca, "One goes mad with lust, another serves his belly,"[92] and the impatience and scorn of immorality expressed in the stinging words of Epictetus, "But we think about ourselves as if we were nothing but bellies, guts, and *pudenda.*"[93] The adulterer,[94] the effeminate,[95] the wanton youth,[96] all received his stern contempt. But while similar to Paul, the philosophy of conduct is quite different. The Stoic felt disgust at these actions as being unbecoming the man himself, of lessening his dignity. As Epictetus said:

---

[87] Eph. 5:4 f.

[88] Epict., *Ench.* 33, 15 f.

[89] *de Brev. Vit.* 7, 1.

[90] P. 27.

> What does he lose who is victim of unnatural lust? He loses his manhood. And the agent of such lust, what does he lose? He loses his manhood like the other and much beside. What does the adulterer lose? He loses the man of honor, and self control, the gentleman, the citizen, the neighbor. What does the angry man lose? Something else. The man who fears? Something else. No one is evil without destruction and loss.[97]

For Paul all these offenses were seen in their relation to a loving God, as an insult to him and a defilement of Christ against whom every evil act reverted.

That the incorporating of lengthy list of vices and virtues, a device of which Paul is very fond, was not original to him, but was based on earlier Jewish and pagan series is well known. The matter of the *Lasterkataloge* has received considerable attention recently, particularly in German. The work need not be repeated here. Lietzmann's short statement in his commentary on Romans[98] conveniently summarizes the material. Deissmann[99] mentions the counters used in the ancient game similar to checkers which give the names of a large number of virtues and vices and substantially duplicate all the vices listed in I Cor. 6:9, 10.[100]

---

[91] Phil. 3:19.

[92] *de Benef.* 7, 26, 4.

[93] 1, 9, 26; cf. 2, 9, 4.

[94] 2, 4, 1–11.

[95] 3, 1, 27–38.

[96] 4, 9, 1–18; cf. 2, 22, 28.

[97] 2, 10, 17 f.

The discovery of these similar lists and the knowledge that it was a customary form in writing is particularly valuable to the student of the ethics of Paul. It discourages the attempt to systematize his frequent lists with climaxes and the like, and suggests the probability that a test case for every vice listed might not have been forthcoming to his mind. Particularly clear is this in the famous catalogue in Rom. 1:29 ff. A very complete list of all the hateful vices he could think of is heaped together. One suggests another, sometimes by the similarity of the vice, as in the case of ψιθυριστάς and καταλάλους; at other times by the similarity of the sound, paronomasia, φθόνου, suggesting φόνου; ἀσυνέτους ἀσυνθέτους, while the last five all commence with the alpha privative.

This probability is heightened by K. Weidinger's monograph, *Die Haustafeln* (1928). In the letters of the New Testament are a number of paranetic sections giving admonitions and warnings to folk in various situations of life. Much of the advice given is not conspicuously appropriate to the specific situation, while the connection of the sections to the rest of the letter is often extremely loose (cf. the omission of the verb in Eph. 5:22). Nor are these examples of Christian *Paränese* without earlier parallel. In Hellenistic Judaism and in the philosophy of Hellenism alike are strikingly similar sections. The probability is therefore high that these earlier pre-Christian *Haustafeln* were taken over by the early Christians and gradually Christianized, first by the addition of some distinctly Christian touch, as "in the Lord" or "well pleasing to the Lord," and later more decidedly altered. Along with these general admonitions, appropriate to almost any person or group, are others especially appropriate in the specific circumstance (contrast the admonitions given to bishops, I Tim. 3:1 ff., with the pointed and apt word to the "widows," a group unique apparently to early Christianity, I Tim. 5:3 ff.).

---

[98] *Römerbrief*, pp. 34 f.; cf. also Dieterich, *Nekyia*, pp. 163 ff.; von Arnim, *Stoicorum Vet. Fragm.*, iii, pp. 92–133.

[99] *Light from the Ancient East*^{4}, pp. 315 ff.

[100] The "covetous" and "idolaters" are the only exception.

But in this list in Romans, as in the others, the vices decried seem to fall into two general classes: those of impurity—"carnal," sexual sins—which defile the body, and those primarily anti-social in nature, such as murder, greed, bitterness, and partisan spirit which tends to disrupt the fellowship and unity of the group. No division is completely happy. To Paul the word *carnal* would not have signified the same as it does to us, for to him all sins were of the flesh *i.e.*, of the old nature which the Christians had sloughed off, while the sins of impurity destroyed true *koinonia.* The Christians were all members of one body, Christ's body; accordingly, the sin of the individual against his own body was a sin against all. But in spite of its obvious limitation a division seems necessary. In this chapter the chief emphasis has been laid, where Paul himself laid it, on the sins of lust to which the Christians were particularly subject and which were innately hostile to the mystic union of believer and Lord. In a later chapter we shall have occasion to notice those of an anti-social or primarily selfish nature. It need hardly be suggested that it is not the purpose of this volume to engage in lexicographical studies of the terms for the various vices. That phase of the investigation is properly the work of the commentator. Accordingly, no attempt has been made to discuss every term that Paul used, nor to cite every passage, but to strive to indicate what he felt to be the chief hindrance to the kind of life he was striving to inculcate in his churches.

ETHOD &
PURPOSE

RUNKENNESS

One or two matters connected with personal purity or separateness from vice demanded of the saint need yet be considered. The first is the question of drunkenness. Drunkenness never constituted a very serious problem in Palestine. That individuals got drunk is, of course, apparent from the figure of the reeling drunkard in the Old Testament, but it apparently never became a national problem, nor was the use of wine in moderation condemned. The opposition to wine by the Rechabites was not on moral grounds, but was due to their opposition to everything pertaining to settled life. Of course, grape-growing was impossible for nomads. A Rabbinic statement, though later in date, is interesting:

> He who subjects himself to needless self-castigations and fastings, or even denies himself the enjoyment of wine, is a sinner.[101]

This recalls the saying of R. Isaac:

> Are not the things prohibited you in the law enough for you, that you want to prohibit yourself other things? [102]

According to Moore,[103] Maimonides quotes this saying as the most noteworthy principle he knows on the subject. In this connection the candor of Philo is refreshing:

> His name is Abimilech, who, gazing out of the window with the well-opened and radiant eye of the mind, saw Isaac sporting with Rebecca his wife. For what employment more befits the wise man than to be sporting and rejoicing and diverting himself with perseverance in good things? From which it is plain that he will become drunk, since drunkenness (τῆς μέθης) contributes to good morals (ἠθοποιούσης) and also brings about relaxation and profit; for unmixed wine seems to increase and render more intense all the natural qualities, whether they be good or the reverse, as many other things do too. . . . So also unmixed wine when poured forth in abundance renders the man who is a slave to his passions still more subservient to them, but him who has them under his control more amenable and good natured. Who, indeed, is there who does not know that of two opposite things, when one thing is suitable to most people, the other kind must of necessity be suited to some? . . . And, again, to be sober and to be drunk

---

[101] Ta'anit 11a, 22b, quoted by Kohler, art. "Ethics," *Jewish Encyclopedia*, v, p. 249.

[102] Jer. Nedarim 41b.

[103] *Judaism*, ii, p. 265, n. 4.

> are two opposite things. Accordingly, both bad men and good, as the ancient proverb goes, partake of sobriety (*τοῦ νήφειν*); therefore, also, drunkenness is suitable to both classes. Therefore the virtuous man will get drunk without losing any of his virtue thereby.[104]

But if drunkenness constituted no problem for Judaism, it did for Greece and Rome. The wild Bacchic orgies of the Thracian Dionysus had seemed very distasteful to the staid Roman. Indeed, Roman women were forbidden on pain of death to drink wine, probably because the use of wine excited amorous propensities. Pliny tells us:

> At Rome it was not lawful for women to drink wine. Among the various anecdotes connected with this subject, we find that the wife of Egnatius Mecenius was slain by her husband with a stick, because she had drunk some wine from the vat, and that he was absolved from the murder by Romulus. Fabius Picator, in his book of *Annals*, has stated that a certain lady, for having opened a purse in which the keys of the wine cellar were kept, was starved to death by her family. And Cato tells us that it was the usage for the male relatives to give the females a kiss, in order to "ascertain whether they smelt of wine (*temetum*)." [105]

The Greeks did not forbid the use of wine to women, but punished with the greatest severity any excesses. Indeed, a special word was used to designate a drunken woman,[106] though from Menander down this distinction was often ignored. For men, Plato had taught that no youth under eighteen was to touch wine; from eighteen to forty he might drink in moderation, but never to the degree of intoxication; after forty he might do as he chose.[107]

---

[104] *de Plant.* 41 (§§169–172) 353 f. M.

[105] *Hist. Nat.* xiv, 14 (13).

[106] *μέθυσος ἀνήρ, οὐκ ἐρεῖς, ἀλλὰ μεθύστικος· γυναῖκα δὲ ἐρεῖς μέθυσον καὶ μεθύσην*—(Phrynicus).

There is no indication that Paul's opposition was to wine in itself; rather it was to the revelry with which it was associated. In Eph. 5:18, after admonishing them to walk in a profitable way, as wise men, not as fools, he wrote, "And be not drunken with wine, wherein is dissoluteness (ἀσωτία)."[108] The dissoluteness lay in the getting drunk with wine, and in the resultant reckless and unseemly conduct, not in the wine itself. The wild revelry and nocturnal carnivals with which Greek cities were becoming increasingly familiar, the riotous processions of intoxicated men and women which often followed the emotional exaltation of the rites of initiation into the pagan cults, were well known to Paul. It was no haphazard chance that led him to write:

> The night is far spent, and the day is at hand; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light. Let us walk becomingly, as in the day; not in revelling and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and jealousy.[109]

The connection between drunkenness and sexual impurity was often stressed by both Jewish and pagan moralists.[110] And actually this evil which characterized pagan feasts was making its appearance at the Christian meal. His word, "One is hungry, and another is drunken"[111] is intended as a rebuke of the anti-social nature of such an act—some eat and drink to excess while the poor go hungry. Nevertheless, the other danger appears to be sensed.[112] It is obvious how great the danger was that the Gentile Christians might lower the standard of the Christian meal to that of the pagan rites with which they were familiar, and that the dissolute nature of the heathen feasts with their sexual irregularities and confusion might infect the Christian circle. It was with deep feeling that Paul wrote to the Thessalonians:

---

[107] *Legg.* ii, 9, 666AB.

[108] Apparently the word meant prodigality, reckless and unjustified squandering. Aristotle (*Eth. Nic.* iv, 1, 3–1119b) contrasts it with stinginess (ἀνελευθερία) and explains that, while the latter term was invariably restricted to those over-careful about wealth, the former was applied to those who fail of self-control and spend money in the unrestrained gratification of their passions.

[109] Rom. 13:12 f.

> But ye, brethren, are not in darkness; that that day should overtake you as a thief: for ye are all sons of light, and sons of the day: we are not of the night nor of darkness; so then let us not sleep,

---

[110] For example, *Test. XII Patr.*, *Jud.* 14:1–8; Sen., *Ep. Mor.* 83, 17–21.

[111] I Cor. 11:21. From the Pastoral Epistles it is clear that drinking constituted a real problem. In rules of conduct for the various officers the prescription is that all aspiring to office shall be temperate, not given to much wine (I Tim. 3:2 f., 8, 11; Tit. 1:7; 2:2, 3). The oft-quoted advice, "Be no longer a drinker of water (μηκέτι ὑδροπότει), but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmities" (I Tim. 5:23), which Moffatt omits from his translation—although the support of the textual apparatus is unanimous—as "either a marginal gloss or misplaced," is probably not to be interpreted as "definitely medical advice against total abstinence" (R. S. J. Parry, *Pastoral Epistles* (1920), in loc.). That such use was made of wine in antiquity is well attested, but with the rejection of the claim of the letter to be the word of Paul to Timothy the force of the personal advice is lessened and the probability increased that we have a later polemic against a formal ascetic practice, specifically the substitution of water for the wine of the Lord's Supper. If this is so, we would have the phenomenon, by no means rare, of two contrary tendencies at work: opposition to over-indulgence in wine and at the same time to the ascetic rejection of it entirely.

[112] That this was no idle fear is evident from the later history of the church; cf. Jude.

> as do the rest, but let us watch and be sober. For they that sleep sleep in the night; and they that are drunken are drunken in the night. But let us, since we are of the day, be sober, putting on the breastplate of faith and love; and for a helmet the hope of salvation. For God appointed us not unto wrath, but unto the obtaining of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with him.[113]

Seneca might denounce the over-use of wine as in *Ep. Mor.* 83, and give elaborate reasons why the wise man should not get drunk. Himself a teetotaler and a gentleman of culture, drunkenness with its attending characteristics disgusted him. The inebriated man so far lost his poise and self-control as to be actually a slave to appetite. To the Stoic this was unpardonable. To Paul the matter was quite different. Here were Christians set apart in consecration to Christ with a wondrous hope before their eyes, salvation assured and momentarily expected; yet in spite of that they were in danger of succumbing to a debauchery and license that made the Gentile hateful to God. They were no longer of the night, but of the day; they were not appointed to wrath as were the Gentiles, but to a wonderful hope. With this obligation and this incentive there could be no halfway measures. They must put aside all that hindered and defiled, and walk worthily of their calling.

Paul's constant emphasis on the need of sexual purity and the Christian's obligation to keep himself separate from all that would defile had brought about a natural

---

[113] I Thes. 5:4–10.

MARRIAGE

result in Corinth. Doubt had arisen in the minds of some as to the propriety of Christians marrying at all or even of continuing living in the married state. Was not celibacy more fitting to one *in Christ?* Would it not be better for those who were married to dissolve their union? To their practical question Paul made his answer. Well did he see that a real danger menaced the peace and good name of the church at Corinth due to this zeal which was not accompanied by sufficient steadfastness to make it successful. For those who, like himself, could preserve continence he felt the unmarried state was preferable. But realizing that comparatively few had the power of self-control, exposed as they were to all the temptations of a Greek city with the opportunities for illicit intercourse, he advised marriage, not because it was in itself the better state—indeed, celibacy was preferable—but to prevent fornication: "It is better to marry than to burn."[114]

But to the married his word was clear. There was to be no thought of separation. The marital bond was to be preserved. Marriage was no sin, nor was it incompatible with consecration to Christ. The rights of the married partner were to be scrupulously observed. Nothing was to be allowed to interfere. Paul saw clearly what every moralist knows to be true, that the surest way to sow the seeds of domestic discord was to interfere with the normal relations of husband and wife.[115]

---

[114] I Cor. 7:9.

[115] With I Cor. 7:3, 4 should be compared Musonius, 13a, ed. Hense, p. 67, . . . *καὶ κοινὰ δὲ ἡγεῖσθαι πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ἴδιον, μηδ 'αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα* ("All things are to be considered joint possessions and nothing the private possession of either, not even the body itself").

And not only that, such conduct would destroy the purpose for which he recommended marriage. The partner cheated would probably find his satisfaction elsewhere, and the marriage bed would be defiled. Adultery would take the place of fornication. Accordingly, he specified that if there were to be any cessation at all[116] of conjugal relations it must be only "for a time, that you may give yourselves unto prayer," and that by mutual consent.[117] The usual gratuitous comment that Jew and Gentile alike believed that intercourse caused or involved ceremonial uncleanness is particularly out of place in a discussion of I Cor. 7. It is not that intercourse would defile and so unfit the couple for prayer, but that it might interfere with prayer without ceasing.

Nor were husbands and wives to separate. On the Lord's authority, not his own, [118] he urged the indissoluble nature of the marriage relation. As suggested in an earlier chapter, Paul agrees with Jesus' well-known attitude toward divorce, although he amplifies the prohibition of all divorce to include that act of wife as well as husband.[119] If the wife left her husband she must remain single. Similarly, the husband was not to leave his wife. But then Paul turned to a problem incident to life in an early Christian community with which Jesus had not been concerned. There were cases where a husband or wife had been converted to Christianity while the partner had not. Should the believer separate himself from the unbeliever? This was a problem peculiarly of the past, for of course no Christian was to marry an unbeliever.[120] But these unions already consummated were not to be broken. They were just as valid as were any others. Nor was the Christian to fear defilement through continuing to live with his heathen mate. Actually the unbelieving partner was in a measure consecrated (ἡγίασται), v. 14, by the Christian.[121] Indeed, it could not be otherwise, for if so the children born of that union would be unclean (ἀκάθαρτα), which was obviously impossible. The Christian member was to be scrupulous in keeping his agreement, but, should the unbeliever desire to separate, the Christian was to allow it, since, after all, there was no assurance that the unbeliever would finally be converted.[122] The chance was too slim to risk the discord and rancor that would result. God had called them for peace, not strife. They were not bound slavishly to such an "irritant marriage."

---

[116] Cf. the qualification implied by ἄν.

[117] I Cor. 7:5. Cf. the similar view in *Test. XII Patr.*, *Naph.* 8:8—"For there is a season for a man to embrace his wife, and a season to refrain therefrom for his prayer." As students of the Jewish law were allowed to postpone their marriage while studying, so they might refrain from intercourse for a period of thirty days without the consent of their wives. For artisans this period was limited to one week. M. Ketobot 5, 6. See further, Strack und Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, iii, p. 372.

[118] I Cor. 7:10.

[119] See pp. 109 f.

No passage in Paul shows more clearly the sharp distinction between the *saint* and the unbeliever. What the unbeliever did was not the business of the church.[123] Each Christian, however, was to guard scrupulously against acting wrongly. Then there could be no ground for complaint on the part of the unbeliever that Christians were innovating new customs or perverting morals. In this connection it is to be observed that Augustus (B.C. 18) struck a decided blow against bachelors at Rome. They had not remained unmarried on ascetic or religious grounds, but simply because the women were too extravagant and degenerate. This reluctance to marry apparently constituted a serious problem, since the *Lex Julia et Papia Poppœa*, with its prescription of marriage and the procreation of children till the age of sixty and fifty, respectively, for male and female, with drastic penalties for failures, met with decided opposition.[124] And Aulus Gellius [125] remarks that whereas old age had formerly had a particular claim to honor, it was replaced by the fact of being married and of having the greatest number of children alive or slain in war. There is always a temptation to wonder whether Paul purposely toned down his advice to celibacy for fear of arousing the ire of Rome.[126]

---

[120] Cf. I Cor. 7:39.

[121] Cf. the quotation from an unknown source in I Clem. 46:2, "Cleave to the holy for they who cleave to them shall be made holy." Cf. also Hermas, *Sim.* 8, 8, 1.

[122] When Paul speaks of the non-Christian partner being consecrated by union with the Christian, he does not mean that such a union leads to salvation. Rather it was a judgment of convenience for the comfort and safety of the Christian mate. To be of value to the non-Christian he too must become ἐν Χριστῷ.

Only here does Paul give his views on the matter of divorce,[127] but the uncompromising nature of his words would seem to indicate fear that the inconstancy and frivolity in the matter of divorces—quite modern, in fact—was in some danger of infecting the Christian group.

---

[123] Cf. I Cor. 5:12.

[124] Döllinger, *Heidenthum und Judenthum,* p. 703 f. [E. T., ii, p. 257].

[125] *Noct. Att.* ii, 15, 4.

[126] In this connection the incident recorded by Justin Martyr (*Apol.* ii, 3) is instructive.

[127] In a monograph, *The Teaching of the New Testament on Divorce* (1921), R. H. Charles has discovered in I Cor. 7:11a a non-Pauline interpolation, "which contains the only words in the N. T. which forbid remarriage after divorce," pp. 51 f.; while in I Cor. 6:13–17 he finds that "it follows inevitably

Divorces were very common among Jews and Gentiles alike.[128] Women in Greece and Rome might divorce their husbands.[129] This was not allowed a Jewish woman. Of Salome's action in divorcing Costobarus Josephus wrote:

> For with us it is lawful for a husband to do so; but a wife if she departs from her husband, cannot of herself be married to another, unless her former husband put her away.[130]

Yet a Jewish woman could sue for divorce in the courts to make her husband divorce her. And the courts would decide in her favor in the case of impotence, denial of conjugal rights, undo restraint, loathsome disease, and unpleasant occupation.[131]

Much is written regarding the ease of divorce among the Jews. As a matter of fact, the rabbis seem regularly

---

that if a married man joins himself to a harlot, he becomes one body with her and thereby severs at one and the same time the bond *that unites him to his wife* and the bond that unites him to Christ" (italics mine) p. 68. The book, while exceedingly poorly written, contains much useful material, which, however, is to a considerable extent invalidated by his obvious determination to extract the teaching he wanted to find. Many of his "findings," particularly in his extraordinary knack of discovering interpolations, are not so evident to those who, unlike him, have not had the privilege of having "the light come in a flash" (p. vii). See also a later study by the same author, *Divorce and the Roman Dogma of Nullity* (1927).

[128] Cf. Hermann, *Privataltertümer*³, §xxx, pp. 260–268; Döllinger, *op. cit.*, pp. 700–702 [E. T., ii, pp. 254–257].

[129] Hermann, *op. cit.*, p. 264; Sohm, *Institutionen*⁷, §97 [E. T.², pp. 494–497].

[130] *Antt.* 15, 7, 10.

[131] Moore, *Judaism*, ii, p. 125.

to have disapproved of divorce and to have sought to prevent it. R. Johanan understood Mal. 2:6 to mean "Hateful [to God] is the man who puts away his wife," while R. Eleazar saw in a preceding verse clear evidence that the very altar drops tears on every one who divorces his first wife.[132] Yet in spite of this reluctance the law (Deut. 24:1) clearly allowed a man to divorce his wife if he found in her some unseemly thing. About the nature of this unseemly thing, however, there was wide difference of opinion. The followers of Hillel maintained that the unseemly thing was "unchastity *or* something else." Akiba, for example, declared that a man might divorce his wife if he discovered a fairer. Did not the law specify, "if she find no favor in his eyes?" The school of Shammai, on the contrary, restricted the unseemly thing to the "matter of unchastity." Eventually the judgment of Hillel was accepted as authoritative.

As in the state of morality in the heathen world, so in the matter of the frequency of divorce there has undoubtedly been exaggeration. Yet after all allowance has been made it cannot be disputed that divorces in the Roman world were granted on the slightest whim. Sulpicius is said to have put his wife away because she ventured into the street unveiled; Sophus his for failing to ask his permission to attend the theater. The divorces and subsequent marriages for political reasons in the late days of the republic need not be rehearsed. Stern moralist as he was, Cato divorced two wives, remarry-ing the second after the death of the husband who had her during her days as a divorcee.[133] Further illustrations are profitless. Seneca's words are familiar:

---

[132] Moore, *Judaism*, ii, p. 123.

> Why should divorce mantle the cheek of any woman with shame now that most of the high and distinguished ladies count their years not by the number of the consuls but by the number of their husbands, and are divorced in order to marry, and marry in order to be divorced?[134]

Similarly, Juvenal remarks, satirically: "Thus five autumns saw eight husbands."[135] Nor did matters mend materially in the late empire. Jerome writes that at Rome he saw "a triumphant husband bury his twenty-first wife who had interred twenty-two of his less sturdy predecessors."[136] The Roman matron Chloe inscribed on the tomb of her seven husbands the suggestive words, "Chloe fecit."[137] That this laxity is reflected in Paul's severity is scarcely open to question.

Having forbidden unconditionally any tendency toward disruption of family life once it had been entered upon, Paul turned to the questions of the virgins. No passage in Paul is more difficult than I Cor. 7:25-38. Apparently the words, "Now concerning virgins" (περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων), are not to be understood of unmarried women in general, but of a group of men and women who had taken certain vows of chastity and so were really πάρθενοι (virgins), and who lived together in a sort of spiritual marriage.[138] Then Paul states two reasons for advocating celibacy to such as can stand it: (1) The end of the age was near. Momentarily the Parousia was expected. It would surely come in that generation. Thus there would be no need of a future generation to keep the race alive. In v. 24 he had ended an exhortation against change of state, were it of circumcision or uncircumcision, of slavery or freedom, with the words, "Brethren, let each man wherein he was called, therein abide with God." This argument he repeats in v. 26,

---

[133] Plutarch, *Cato Min.* 7; 25; 52.

[134] *de Benef.* 3, 16, 2.

[135] *Sat.* 6, 229 f.; cf. Martial, *Epigr.* vi, 7.

[136] *Ep.* 123, 10.

[137] Martial, *Epigr.* ix, 16.

> I think therefore that this is good by reason of the distress that is upon us, namely, that it is good for a man to be as he is (τὸ οὕτως εἶναι),

that is, to remain *in statu quo.* If married, they were not to seek a divorce; but if unmarried they were to remain so. There is a temptation to read τὸ οὕτως εἶναι as meaning, "as I [Paul] am," that is, unmarried, but the sequence of thought in v. 27 would seem to make the other interpretation slightly more probable. Though they who marry commit no sin, they will incur afflictions. By dissuading them from marriage he strove to spare them this. It is quite possible that Paul's desire to spare them the "tribulation in the flesh" (v. 28) reflects the current Jewish apocalyptic thought of the woes that were destined to come in the final tribulation when there would be monstrous and premature births and when mothers would abandon their children.[139]

---

[138] Cf. Achelis, *Virgines Subintroductæ.* Perhaps Rev. 14:4 and Hermas *Sim.* 9, 11, 1–4 may be cited in illustration of a custom well known in the later church until gradually suppressed because of natural but unfortunate results.

(2) Paul's second reason was that the unmarried Christian would be freer to serve the Lord. His thoughts would be on how to please the Lord, and his attention would be directed to his service; the married man with his obligations would be primarily concerned with his wife. So he concludes: My advice to you "virgins" is that such of you as can continue in this state do so, and my intention, far from being to deprive you of any privilege or pleasure, is simply to promote that which is seemly and to aid you in attending upon the Lord without distractions.

The interpretation of vv. 36-38 has long been debated, but the interpretation which is becoming increasingly popular with modern scholars[140] seems on the whole in keeping with the whole section. According to this view, Paul is discussing not a father's reluctance to give his daughter in marriage, but a very pertinent problem arising in the common life of these virgins. What Paul says, if this view is correct, would seem to be: So long as this relationship can exist, it is well, but if the man's natural appetites become too strong and the continual proximity proves too much a temptation, let them marry rather than yield to illicit love. Yet the one who can restrain himself does better.[141] Similarly, widows were

[139] IV Ezra 5:8; 6:21; Enoch 99:5; cf. Mark 13:7–27 (esp. v. 17) and parallels.

[140] For a detailed statement see Lake, *Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, pp. 184–191. Both J. Weiss and Lietzmann adopt a similar interpretation in their commentaries. It is interesting to observe that Ephrem Syrus understands the situation in the same manner (Lietzmann, *Handb.*, p. 36).

[141] Cf. Matt. 19:12.

free to remarry after the deaths of their husbands so far as the matter of right and wrong went, but in their case, too, Paul reiterated his judgment, It is better if they remain as they are.[142]

If this interpretation of I Cor. 7 is correct, the attempt to make the matter of the comparative worth of celibacy and marriage, debated constantly from the days of Tertullian[143] a fundamental question for Paul is wrong. His only reference to it, at least so far as his extant works are concerned, is in answer to a question of one of his churches. He makes no spontaneous statement. In his answer he plainly says that for the majority of the Christians marriage is the only course feasible. But in the group of self-constituted virgins there is a greater possibility that celibacy with its more complete severance from the cares and duties of life and with its greater opportunity for studying the will of God may be possible. Yet even here it is not for all. Paul was too severely practical a moralist and was too much worried by the dangers that menaced the life of his uncertain churches to allow himself to yield, even if it were his inclination, to a more outspoken praise of celibacy.

---

[142] I Cor. 7:39, 40; cf. Rom. 7:2.

[143] For example, Tertullian in a friendly treatise to his wife (*ad Uxor.* i, 3) extols the superiority of celibacy to married life. Paul may say that marriage is better than burning, yet what is better than an obvious evil is not necessarily good. He reverts to this same line of argument in another treatise (*de Monog.* 3): losing one eye is better than losing two, though surely hardly to be called good. Jerome (*adv. Jovin.* i, 7) with his customary delicacy of expression compares virginity to wheat flour, wedlock to barley, and fornication to cow-dung, and adds, "'It is good to feed on wheaten bread and to eat the finest wheat flour,' and yet to prevent a person pressed by hunger from devouring cow-dung I may allow him to eat barley."

After all, Christianity was the daughter of Judaism, and Paul was a Jew. By Judaism, with the exception of the Therapeutæ and Essenes of whom we know practically nothing and of whose influence we can assert absolutely nothing, chastity and marriage were considered to go hand in hand. Zöckler is quite within the facts when he says, "Christianity was a religion not of asceticism, but of faith and love.[144] Such asceticism as the early Christian did practice was really not consciously asceticism. It was the preparation for the coming glorious victory; not the counsel of despair to which the later monasticism may fairly be said to have owed its origin. Much loose talk concerning Paul's asceticism is current, and is due in no small measure to the inexact use of the word. The asceticism of self-discipline which is the training of the Christian athlete that Martin[145] speaks of is really no asceticism at all. Asceticism had its rise in the conscious dualism of soul and matter with the desire to rid the former of the latter, to go to the extreme and, instead of being satisfied with temperance and moderation—the normal view of the moral pagan—to cut across the grain of the natural man and his inclination as far as possible. Christianity did not make the world ascetic; rather the world in which Christianity found itself strove to make Christianity ascetic. Paul was influenced to a considerable degree by the dualism between "flesh" and "spirit," as has been seen. He did not hesitate, as, for example, in Col. 3:5, to use language that sounds ascetic to a degree he did not intend. His word was: "Put to death therefore your members which are upon the earth." The members, however, were the vices of immorality which he was constantly attacking:[146] as you have died and your true nature is hidden with Christ in God, carry out this death to the world and kill whatever is carnal in you. Yet it is in precisely this epistle that he attacks most strenuously the ascetic demands of his gnostic opponents: "Handle not, nor taste, nor touch"—all of which he stigmatized as "after the precepts and doctrines of men."[147] Paul was using dualistic terms not as one to the manner born; fundamentally he was a Jew. This dualism was Greek. In his usage it underwent a great change. The important fact for him was that the saint had undergone a revolutionary change in life wherein the old man had died and the new man had arisen. This involved abandoning, putting to death, all the vices that had been part and parcel of the old nature but were no longer possible for the one who was in Christ.

---

[144] *Askese und Mönchtum*, p. 176.

[145] W. Martin, *St. Paul's Ethical Teaching* (1917), pp. 146–149.

In the Old Testament there is no ban on marriage, even for the priests. There were certain standards for their wives, but celibacy was never hinted at, nor could it have been, since the Hebrew was to be fruitful and multiply (Gen. 1:28). To marry and raise a large family was a praiseworthy act. Similarly, in the Rabbinic literature man is bidden to marry and to have children.[148]

---

[146] Reitzenstein (*Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*, pp. 121–124) sees in Paul's calling the following vices μέλη an indication of the view that a certain number of virtues (sometimes seven, sometimes twelve) were "members" constituting the god or new man as did vices the natural man.

[147] Col. 2:21 f.

"He who lives without a wife lives without joy and blessing, without protection and peace."[149] Such a one is "not a complete man."[150] Indeed, for such a course he will have to give account at the Judgment Day.[151] It was customary for a Jewish boy to marry at the age of eighteen; cases occur where it was as early as thirteen. If he passed the age of twenty unmarried, he transgressed a divine command and incurred God's displeasure.[152] It is really peculiar that neither Jesus nor Paul married. Against those heretics who forbade marriage and cited the example of Jesus, Clement of Alexandria felt it necessary to explain that Jesus had not married since he was the bridegroom of the church and no ordinary man; child-bearing for him, the eternal Son of God, was unnecessary.[153] All the apostles, however, Clement continues, were married, even Paul (I Cor. 9:5).[154]

Neither the Rechabites nor the Nazarites forbade marriage. Josephus says of the Essenes:

> [They] reject pleasures as an evil, but esteem continence, and the conquest over our passions, to be virtue. Marriage they disdain. . . . They do not absolutely deny the fitness of marriage and the

---

[148] Yebamot 63b; Mekilta, Yitro 8.

[149] Yebamot 62a.

[150] *Ibid.* 63a.

[151] Shabbat 31a. For these references I am indebted to Kohler's article, "Ethics," *Jew. Encyc.*, v, p. 249.

[152] Kiddushin 29b, end—Moore, *Judaism*, ii, p. 119.

[153] *Strom.* iii, 6 (Migne viii, 1152 BC).

[154] *Idem.* (Migne 1158A).

> succession of the race thereby, but they guard against the lascivious behavior of women, and are convinced that no one of them preserves her fidelity to one man.[155]

Another order of Essenes, however, which advocated marriage but not "out of regard for pleasure, but for the procration of children" existed.[156] The Therapeutæ also extolled the virtues of celibacy in the most extravagant of terms, though admitting women to their society.[157] But neither of these sects had any appreciable influence in Judaism. After the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. some Jews for a time adopted celibacy in despair.

The view that there was anything defiling about the marriage relation was foreign to the Jews. No wives had been furnished for the immortal angels in heaven, since as ever-living spirits there was no need of increase (Enoch 15:4–7; cf. Matt. 22:30), yet marriage, continues the author of Enoch, was appointed for men upon earth to continue the race. From this R. H. Charles deduces:

> He [*i.e.*, the author of chapters 83–90] is moreover of an ascetic turn of mind. The visions came to him before he was married, the implication being that he has no such supernatural experience after marriage.[158]

This gratuitous observation is based on the words of 85:3, "Before I took thy mother Edna, I saw in a vision of my bed," etc., and 83:2, "Two visions I saw before I took a wife." I fail to see in these passages, which simply serve to date the visions, any ascetic tendency whatever. "Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Psalm 51:5) also has no bearing here, but is a part of the contrite sinner's prayer for pardon, a confession of guilt from his very birth. Nor was the bath which followed intercourse an ablution to purify from an unclean act; on the contrary, it seems to have been precautionary in its nature. Throughout the history of the Hebrews their attitude toward marriage has been sane and unaffected.

---

[155] *Wars* 2, 8, 2.

[156] *Op. cit.* 2, 8, 13.

[157] Philo, *de Vit. Contempl.* viii (§68) 482M.

[158] *Book of Enoch*, p. 27.

Fehrle, in his dissertation, *Die kultische Keuschheit des Altertums* 1910, has discussed the matter of defilement through sexual relations,[159] and has cited many passages illustrating the need of purification after these relations and the need of temporary abstinence before entering religious shrines or engaging in religious exercises, or before battle, hunting, fishing. This was not restrained to the Greeks and Romans; the Babylonians, Arabs, and Hebrews[160] observed similar restrictions and indulged in purification and lustration. Herodotus[161] recounts that it was a Babylonian and Arabian custom for a man and wife, after intercourse, to sit opposite one another before a censer of incense and then to bathe. But this and similar rites probably did not arise from the desire to purge themselves from a defilement, but to ward off possible evil results that might come from a dangerous act. For everything having to do with these functions was mysterious and awesome in the extreme, affording as it did evil demons an opportunity to enter the body.[162] The temporary cessation of intercourse before battle or hunting was probably due to the fear of weakening the man's magic power by making him become a partaker of the weaker feminine nature. But in Fehrle's[163] judgment there seems no evidence that there was anything calculated to arouse the feeling of shame or condemnation in these relations. It need hardly be suggested that originally there was no distinction between intercourse within or without marriage.

---

[159] Pp. 25–42; cf. also Rosenbaum, *Die Lustseuche im Altertums*, pp. 343–353.

[160] Lev. 15:18; cf. Josephus, *Contra Apionem* ii, 24.

[161] *Hist.* i, 198; cf. Strabo, *Geogr.* xvi, 1, 20.

Nor was perpetual celibacy common, although instances occur. In Persia there were sun priestesses who were obliged to refrain from intercourse with men. The nine priestesses of the oracle of a Gallic divinity in Sena were also devoted to perpetual virginity. The Vestal Virgins instituted by Numa were obliged to remain unmarried for a period of thirty years. In Greece oftentimes the priestesses were obliged to remain virgins, at least during the period of their ministrations. That this was not often required of men is evident from the remark of Tertullian, "We have known also of continent men, for example the priests (*antistites*) of that Egyptian bull."[164] Eunuch priests were fairly common in the cults of the Ephesian Artemis,[165] Phrygian Cybele,[166] and Syrian Astarte.[167] The hierophant and other priests of Demeter washed their bodies with hemlock juice to kill passion and were restrained from conjugal intercourse. Chæremon, the Stoic chief librarian of Alexandria and the tutor of Nero, wrote a treatise on the life of the ancient priests of Egypt, who had laid aside all worldly business and cares, and who stayed always in the temple, never having intercourse with women.[168]

---

[162] Fehrle, *op. cit.*, p. 35; cf. J. Main, *Religious Chastity* (1913), p. 206.

[163] *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

[164] *de Exh. Cast.* 13; cf. *de Monog.* 17; *ad Uxor.* i, 6.

[165] Strabo, *Geogr.* xiv, 1, 23.

Instances of permanent celibacy there were, but in practically every case they were limited to the priests or priestesses, and were not required of the devotees. Possibly the cult of Mithras offers an exception, for here there were grades of asceticism and companies of virgins. In all these cases there does not seem to be any instance that would throw any light on Paul's preference for celibacy. This is very significant in view of the not infrequent assertion that Paul got his "ascetic tendencies from Hellenistic sources." There is an ascetic note in Plato, as there is in every idealistic philosophy, and it can be seen in Antisthenes and Zeno and Epictetus,[169] but after all as C. H. Moore has pointed out in his article, "Ascetic Tendencies of the Greek and Roman,"[170] these tendencies were not natural to the

---

[166] Arnobius, *adv. Gent.*, v, 7 (end)—"et sacerdotum *intestibus* honorasse."

[167] Lucian, *de Dea Syr.* passim, esp. 15; 27; 50 ff.; Augustine, *de Civ. Dei* vii, 26; Arnobius, *adv. Gent.* v, 17.

[168] Jerome, *adv. Jovin.*, ii, 13. Whether these priests are to be identified with the *katochoi* connected with each Serapeum is not clear; see Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen*², pp. 78–88, and article, "Katochos," in Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie*, xx, pp. 2526 ff.

[169] Cf. G. F. Moore, *Birth and Growth of Religion*, p. 166.

[170] *Harvard Essays on Classical Subjects* (1912), pp. 97–140.

Greek and Roman. Juvenal[171] gives a vivid picture of the attitude with which the average conservative Roman regarded the Oriental asceticism which was fast being imported into the empire:

> She will break the ice and plunge into the river in the depth of winter, or dip three times in the Tiber at break of day, and will bathe her timid head in its very eddies, and coming out will crawl on bleeding knees, naked and shivering, over the whole field of the haughty king. If white Io commands, she will go even to the outposts of Egypt and fetch water from scorching Meroë to sprinkle on the temple of Isis which towers hard by the ancient sheep-fold.

It was ascetic practices of this type rather than of virginity that the Oriental cults fostered. It would seem unwise to strive to see any striking parallel to Paul's mild preference for virginity in the occasional chastity of the previous night (sometimes ten days) which was enjoined during the rites of Ceres[172] or Isis.[173]

Nor was celibacy advised by the Stoics.

> As to pleasures with women, keep as free from it as possible before marriage; if you do indulge, let it be lawfully. Do not, however, be unpleasantly censorious to those who use these pleasures, nor frequently boast that you do not.[174]

Musonius viewed marriage not only as the sole right and the normal satisfaction of the feelings, but as the very foundation of the family and state and the means of continuance of the race.[175] His hearty opposition to the inhuman custom of exposing children recalls the fact that Epictetus, though a bachelor, had adopted and brought up a child that had been thus abandoned. As a rule, the Stoics advised marriage.[176] To be sure, in the case of the Cynic, the ideal philosopher, Epictetus advised against marriage, although he makes clear that in a republic of wise men there would be no objection even for him to marry and have children—

---

[171] *Sat.* 6, 522–529.

[172] Ovid, *Am.* iii, 10, 2.

[173] *Ibid.*, i, 8, 74; Tibul., *Eleg.* i, 3, 26.

[174] Epict. *Ench.* 33, 8. For similar warnings against unbecoming complacency see Ignatius, *ad Polyc.* 5, 2; I Clem. 38, 2.

> for his wife will be like himself, and his father-in-law will be like him, and his children will be brought up along those lines. But in the present state of affairs, which is like an army in battle array, must not the Cynic be without distraction, entirely free for the service of God . . . ?[177]

It is noteworthy that Epictetus here uses the same word, ἀπερισπάστως (without distraction), which Paul used in I Cor. 7:35, and urges the same consideration to dissuade from marriage, namely, complete freedom to serve God.[178] It is to be observed, however, that this abstention from marriage was recommended only for the Cynic; for the ordinary man marriage was taken for granted.[179] Indeed, Epictetus ridicules the Epicureans who discouraged marriage and the rearing of children, on the ground that these disturbed their tranquillity.[180]

---

[175] Musonius, 13a, ed. Hense, p. 67—*βίου καὶ γενέσεως παίδων κοινωνίαν κεφάλιον εἶναι γάμου.*

[176] Diog. Laert. vii, 121. Zeno and Chrysippus agreed with Plato in counseling a community of wives (Diog. Laert. vii, 131; cf. Epict. 2, 4, 8 ff.).

[177] 3, 22, 67–82.

[178] Cf. also *ὡς ἐν παρατάξει* with Paul's figure *διὰ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνάγκην.* From this Mrs. Carter, in her translation of Epictetus, was inclined "to think that he [Epictetus] was not unacquainted with St. Paul's Epistles; or that he had heard something of the Christian doctrine." Considering that the Pastorals came from the pen of Paul, she finds a further similarity between Epictetus' statement that the Cynic must not be entangled (*ἐμπεπλεγμένον*), and II Tim. 2:4 (*οὐδεὶς στρατευόμενος ἐμπλέκεται*).

[179] 2, 23, 38; 3, 7, 26; 3, 21, 5.

This similarity with the Stoic thought is all the more striking, following as it does a passage that would have been perfectly fitting in the mouth of Seneca:

> Henceforth both those that have wives may be as though they had none; and those that weep, as though they wept not; and those that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and those that buy as though they possessed not; and those that use the world, as not using it to the full; for the fashion of this world passeth away. But I would have you to be free from cares.[181]

With this should be compared a word of Seneca:

> Let us use these things, but not boast of them, and let us use them sparingly, as if they were given for safe-keeping and will be withdrawn.[182]

Nor is the resemblance limited to special passages. Paul's sentiment is quite in line with the Stoic outlook on life.[183] There is no reason to assume literary dependence on the part of either Stoics or Paul, but the greatest for feeling that here and in other places Paul shows himself considerably influenced by current ideas whether absorbed from his environment or directly gained through listening to street-corner preachers.

To return to Paul after a rather lengthy discursus: his cautiously expressed preference for celibacy in I Cor.

---

[180] 3, 7, 19 ff.; cf. 1, 23, 1–10.

[181] I Cor. 7:29–33.

[182] *Ep. Mor.* 74, 18.

[183] This likeness is increased by J. Weiss' proposed translation of the words, *οἱ χρώμενοι τὸν κόσμον ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι*, "die mit der Welt umgehen, sollen sich ihr nicht hingeben" (*Das Urchristentum*, p. 460).

7 is not to be explained on the basis of any ascetic tendencies to be found in either paganism or Judaism, but is specifically his own, although in a measure similar to Matt. 19:11 f. In a way this rather extended discussion of celibacy may seem pointless. Paul apparently states his reasons for advising such as can stand it to refrain from marriage: (1) the nearness of the end of the age which made change of status unwise; (2) the greater freedom the unmarried man had in the service of God—no mean advantage to him, an itinerant missionary. Yet the more one studies Paul, the less certain one is that these really explain his break with the ordinary view which he had inherited, and with which the majority of mankind was perfectly satisfied. After he had come to hold such views, these two advantages might well occur to him and might serve as arguments in his teachings, but they hardly explain his own preference.

What led him to think as he did he has not told us, and all attempts to hit upon the reason are, after all, but guesses, yet with that fact clearly recognized it does not seem improbable that it was due in no small measure to his constant battle with the sexual laxity in his churches. If we are right in the position assumed in this chapter, that this constituted the most serious problem that confronted Paul, it is small wonder that he came to be weary with all connected with it. The laxity and disregard, so prevalent, of all the canons of decency; the fact that even among nominal "saints" the horrid sin of incest had sprung up without causing the rest to be scandalized; the fact that those who prided themselves most on their "spiritual" nature were yet among the worst offenders—all this may well have aroused in the apostle's mind a distrust and the feeling that after all this appetite and all that went with it were connected with the old fleshly nature, and that in so far as possible the wisest way was to keep free from it all. Arnold[184] states that Paul had an "unconquerable repugnance . . . to the sexual relation under any condition whatever," and cites I Cor. 7:1,2 as proof; "a repugnance which reason and religion kept within limits (v. 28), but which yet always breaks out afresh in his writings." There is enough truth in this remark to make careful statement necessary. This "repugnance" was forced upon him by the constant inroads that impurity was making upon the Christians and by long years of almost solitary fighting; thus, to borrow scientific jargon, it was an "acquired characteristic." To feel that he approached his task with ascetic repugnance completely misrepresents the whole matter.

Nor was it at all impossible that Paul realized within himself the danger. An Oriental of passionate nature, unmarried, he may well have known the fight that was necessary. Since his will was strong and his ideals and convictions high, he was able to master himself; others might not be. They might not, as he, have the same consciousness of the Spirit's presence, so that when they were weak they became strong. It is very easy to exaggerate here. Gretserus and others who have seen in the words, "I buffet my body,"[185] a reference to actual flagellation by Paul "ad exstinguendum ardorem venereum,"[186] illustrate the danger in this direction, yet with all necessary allowance the question remains whether, when Paul wrote the concluding verses of Rom. 7, the style of the diatribe was not somewhat colored, or at least given emphasis, by the consciousness that he, too, knew the constant struggle that every human soul underwent even though there was no condemnation to those in Christ Jesus. But after all this is but a *Möglichkeit.*

---

[184] E. V. Arnold, *Roman Stoicism*, p. 426.

The caution is again necessary that from these few verses we should not attempt to extract Paul's attitude toward marriage. Marriage was no sin; indeed, many of the apostles themselves were married men.[187] The motive for marriage suggested in these verses is not a lofty one; yet with them should be compared passages such as Col. 3:18 f., Eph. 5:22-33, and II Cor. 11:2, with their injunctions for husbands and wives to live in the tenderest love, and above all the choice of figure from wedded life to illustrate the union of Christ and the church. With no author more than Paul is the danger of distortion greater in striving to discover his views on any subject by citing one isolated proof text. He was no stranger to his churches, but had preached to them in some cases for years. The result was that his views on many matters were well known, and did not need the elaborate statement in his occasional letters that we might desire. He wrote to give instruction and advice on particular problems then of moment, and used every means and argument he could to carry his point. He did not fight as one beating the air. If everything he wrote be given equal weight—the chance word or illustration made of like importance with the dominant undercurrent of his life—a curious figure arises, but not Paul the Christian apostle.

---

[185] I Cor. 9:27.

[186] For a complete discussion see the essay, "De Hypopiasmo Paulino," by S. Deyling in his volume, *Observationes Sacrae*, i, pp. 322 f. (§ lx).

[187] I Cor. 9:5.

In this discussion of the emphasis Paul laid on moral purity no especial attempt had been made to present him as a unique figure, the only man in antiquity laying great emphasis on purity of life. On the contrary, numerous parallels from Jew and Stoic alike have been cited. Far too often apologists are led to paint the background very black in order to make the central figure stand out in surer relief. If Paul regularly commenced his denouncement of the sins infecting his churches with those specifically of impurity of the personal life, the Jew did the same.

In the *Test. XII Patr.*, *Iss.* 7:2-6 the author clearly reveals the vices which to him were to be eschewed. He gives his description of the honorable, hard-working, clean-minded man. It is significant that the first vices such a man will avoid are those of impurity.

> Except my wife I have not known any woman. I never committed fornication by the uplifting of my eyes. I never drank wine to be led astray thereby. . . .

As has been repeatedly pointed out, Paul came to his task with the tradition of centuries of hatred of sexual impurity behind him, and with the conviction that it was peculiarly a vice of the Gentile world.

In Mark 7:21 f. the list of vices with which the author makes Jesus expand the inclusive "evil thoughts" (*οἱ λογισμοὶ οἱ κακοί*) appears to have been constructed from a group of nine vices falling into three triads: those of impurity, of wrong to the neighbor, and of violence:

fornications, thefts, murders;
adulteries, covetings, wickednesses, (deceit);
lasciviousness, an evil eye, railing, (pride, foolishness).

This original framework has been somewhat obscured by the addition of deceit, pride, and foolishness. The secondary nature of the list in Matt. 15:19 is evident. Here "evil thoughts" is no longer the inclusive term, but is made one of the list, and the order is somewhat modified, probably to make it more conformable with the order of the decalogue. The significant fact is that Mark's list bears evidence of an ancient classification in which sins of sexual impurity came first.[188]

In sexual laxity Paul saw the most deadly menace to the new faith. Once the bars were lowered, nothing could stem the tide. It was no love for the subject that led him to reiterate his warnings against the sins of impurity. There is no trace of the salacious relish that later ascetics—notably Jerome—reveal in describing in detail the shocking vices, and from which not even Seneca is entirely free. The purity of his mind is always apparent even though he may be speaking of evils which ought not even to be named by the saints.[189] This to me is one of the strongest arguments for the justice of the position adopted, that it was here Paul felt the gravest danger. He wrote as he did, not because he enjoyed it, but because the brother for whom Christ died was in deadly peril; the Lord in whom he lived was being profaned; the fellowship of the saints was being threatened.

---

[188] In a recent essay, "Jesus on Sins," in the volume, *Studies in Early Christianity*, edited by Shirley Jackson Case (1928), pp. 193–205, Moffatt discusses the passage. He, too, feels the distinct emphasis against unchastity, and suggests it is due to Jesus' deliberate emphasis upon prohibitions of unchastity and sexual vice.

Nor was his an immature or hasty judgment. For over twenty years he had been at work in the cities of Asia Minor and Greece. Well he knew the source of danger. The possibility is never to be ignored that the dualism that is seen in his writings between "flesh" and "spirit," which can hardly have been a part of his inheritance from Judaism, may well have been gradually forced upon him in the course of his travels by contact with the most degrading sins of the flesh. The progress and development in his thought are too often neglected. We marvel at the distance traveled between Galatians or Romans and Ephesians, but are inclined to overlook the far greater change that must have taken place in the lapse of the years between his experience hard by Damascus and the penning of Galatians.

In his first few writings now extant we see the mature fruit of his thought and experience, the complete revamping of the unmoral concept of mystical union with an unmoral, if not immoral, redeemer-god, to the purity of life characterized by an absolute break with the sins of the past that was the implicate of consecration to the Lord Jesus. The "saint" was *separate* from the fruits of the flesh and the works of darkness, not alone as regards his participation in the new age, but in the present evil age as well. Continuing thus, and thus alone, could he walk in a manner worthy of the gospel of Christ and not as the heathen did.

---

[189] Eph. 5:3.

IN THE conclusion of his second letter to Corinth Paul urged the church: "Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong."[1] In this admonition is contained a second of the fundamental principles of Paul's ethical thought, the need of perseverance and continuance, unflinching constancy, steadfastness in all the conduct of life. In many respects this was a complementary idea to that of separateness or aloofness from all that would defile. As we have seen, as far as the vices incident to the old nature which the Christian had left in the past were concerned, there was but one possible course of conduct. From those sins that would defile his body—the temple of the Holy Spirit—he must hold himself apart, for they were a profanation of Christ. This was incident to his being ἐν Χριστῷ.

But while this was imperative for the saint, it did not comprise the whole of life. He was not an isolated and individual figure, but was in close touch with his fellows and was dwelling in a hostile world. To be sure, he was not of the world, yet in it he would be subject to severe temptation; he must keep his faith steadfast and ever refuse to yield. His life would be a constant warfare against a relentless enemy, sin. For this conquest he must arm himself with the panoply of God that in the final day, having done all, he might stand victorious. Suffering would be his. From it none were exempt. Even the Lord himself had suffered and died. The Christian, too, must steel himself to endure suffering as a good soldier. Nor was uncomplaining patience enough. He must show unswerving constancy, regardless of adversity and suffering, confident that they were nothing in comparison with the glory that would soon be his.

---

[1] I Cor. 16:13.

Not only did Paul paint the state of the Gentiles in gloomy colors, but he shared the contemporary Jewish thought that "this age" was evil and transitory.[2] It was under the domination of Satan, whom he styles, "the god of this age,"[3] and was to be terminated by the return of Christ. This event would usher in the new glorious age.[4] The Christians were to redeem the time, because the days were evil and the end was at hand.[5] Against this wicked and hostile age Paul saw a sinless new age with its promise of complete triumph over the world of sin and of death, and which corresponded in the main to Jesus' "kingdom of God," soon to be ushered in. Although Christians could not hope to avoid all contact with the world, yet they were not of the world; they were but temporarily sojourning in it. As opposed to the enemies of the cross of Christ of fleshly nature who were truly at home in this age, the Christian held his citizenship in heaven.[6]

---

[2] *E.g.*, Gal. 1:4; Rom. 12:2. For a discussion of the two ages ("this age" and the "age to come") see Burton, *ICC Gal.*, pp. 427–431.

[3] II Cor. 4:4.

[4] *E.g.*, I Thes. 4:13–18; I Cor. 15:51–58.

[5] Eph. 5:16; cf. Col. 4:5.

To the Corinthians Paul stressed this point. In the course of his argument he made the point that if they denied their resurrection, tacitly they denied that of Christ, and as a result they would be left dead in sin. Then came the climactic words: "If we have only hoped in Christ in this life, we are of all men most pitiable."[7] This age with its pleasures could not be enjoyed by the Christian. He must indeed suffer and go without. But the children of this age, who gave themselves up to its lusts, would find their joy short-lived. The end was even then at hand. Complete discomfiture would be theirs. But the Christian who kept himself unspotted from the world would find the final assize no terror, but an occasion of honor. Then he would enter on the future life of joy which would far more than make up for the previous suffering. If this hope, however, were to be taken away, the very bottom would drop out of life. The sorrow and privation, the persecution and loneliness, that the Christian must undergo would be all in vain.

In a later chapter[8] we shall have occasion to compare this view with the position of the Jew and Stoic. Here let it suffice to say that it would hardly seem to be fair to force Paul's words to mean that without a system of future rewards and penalties a life of bestial pleasure would be the most sensible. Undoubtedly he would have scoffed such an idea, and would have asserted in no uncertain terms that such a life could not be tolerated under any circumstances by a decent man. Such a suggestion obscures the real emphasis. His attention is focused on the richness of the gift to be conferred and the tragedy involved in losing it. This projection of the sphere of happiness beyond this life, with the resulting feeling of the superiority of the future age to that of the present, could not fail to have a great effect on shaping his moral teaching.

---

[6] Phil. 3:20. This view gained great prominence in early Christian thought. Cf. Jas. 1:1, (see excellent paraphrase in Ropes, *ICC Jas.* in loc.); John 15:19; Hermas, *Sim.* 1, 1, 1–11; II Clem., 5:1, 5; esp. *Ep. ad Diognet.* 5:1–6:10. Cf. also the quotations on pp. 31 f.

[7] I Cor. 15:19.

[8] Pp. 301 ff.

The contrast with the Stoic thought here is significant. The Stoic, too, laid great emphasis on endurance. Indeed, the motto of Epictetus, "Bear and forbear," became their shibboleth, as has already been pointed out.[9] Yet the explanation was quite the reverse. His confidence in the essential goodness of God led him to consider in theory at least that this was the best possible world. Far from feeling that it was under the domination of demons, the universe was actually God himself. Hence the great goal in life was to follow nature, to recognize its demands, to make his life conform. If this were done, the most perfect harmony between man and universe in which he lived would result. One's opposition then would not be to nature but to those passions that obtruded and threw men out of gear with nature.

> Everything is in tune with me that is in tune with thee, O Universe. Nothing for me is too early or too late which is in due time for thee. All is fruit to me which thy seasons bring, O Nature.

---

[9] P. 27.

> From thee are all things, in thee are all things, to thee are all things. There is one who says, "Dear city of Cecrops." Will you not rather say, "Dear city of Zeus?"[10]

Yet it is easy to be led astray by these lyrical outbursts. No less in the emperor philosopher than in Seneca and Epictetus is the note of pathos and desolation, so characteristic of later Stoicism. As has been well said, "For all his belief in the harmony of the universe the Emperor exhorts himself too much to make the best of a sad and wicked world.[11]

While the primary reason for Paul's distrust of the present age and all connected with it may well have been due to an "inheritance accepted on what he believed to be the authority of Jesus"[12] and may thus be attributed to his *Weltanschauung* where the apocalyptic ranged large, another element must be considered. The opposition that had confronted him on every point in his effort to make the gospel known, and the constant battle he had waged against impurity, which with its kindred vices seemed so firmly entrenched in the natural man as to make up his very members, can hardly have failed to have had a decided influence on his attitude toward the world. Referring to a previous letter that he had sent to the Corinthians and which had apparently caused them some concern, Paul expressed vividly his view of the world.[13] The Corinthians could not expect to avoid all contact with those of disreputable life—the only possible way to achieve that would be to leave the world entirely—but they could and must zealously guard their own number from contamination, and must, should a case occur, exclude the guilty party.

---

[10] M. Aurel, 4, 23.

[11] C. H. Moore, *Religious Thought of the Greeks*, p. 256.

[12] Burton, *ICC Gal.*, p. 431.

[13] I Cor. 6:10 ff.

This suggests the necessity for a word of caution. It must not be supposed that the early Christian could wall himself in from the rest of the world and so avoid all contact with it. Many of the Christians were slaves of heathen masters and would be obliged to serve even in revelry and debauchery. Others were married to unbelievers (ἄπιστοι). These ties could not be broken. What the Christian could do was to keep himself separate from their vices, and, in whatever walk of life he found himself, walk in a manner worthy of the gospel and of the unique character he bore. Paul does not discuss at any length the matter of the relation of the "saint" with the "unbeliever." I think, however, it is accurate to say that his general attitude is expressed by the advice "Be discreet; do nothing to bring the name of Christ into contempt."

Though insistent that every obligation should be scrupulously met, the consciousness of the distinctness of the Christian group from the rest of the world is obvious. A casual phrase like, "and the Lord make you to increase and abound in love *one toward another, and toward all men,*"[14] reveals the gulf. They were to practice virtues to all men, yet the first duty was to their own number.[15] Obedience and loyalty to the government were demanded, yet the Christians were not to air their troubles in the courts, but were to try their own cases (if they could not bring themselves to suffer the wrong in silence) and were not to seek redress through some unbeliever.[16]

---

[14] I Thes. 3:12.

[15] Cf. Gal. 6:10, "So then, as we have opportunity, let us work that which is good toward all men, and especially toward them that are of the household of the faith."

In their daily life the Christians could hardly help coming into the closest contact with non-believers. In I Cor. 10:27 ff. it is assumed that the Christian will be invited out to dinner by one of the ἄπιστοι. There was no harm in going; the only obligation of the Christian consisted in acting worthily, and in refraining from doing anything that might cause another to stumble or to yield to temptation. In all their relations with those who were not of their number they were to guard in every way against bringing discredit upon the Christian name. Indeed, to the troublesome group of "loafers"[17] at Thessalonica no inconsiderable stress was laid on this very point. Their action was calculated to bring criticism upon the Christian group; accordingly, Paul concluded:

> But we exhort you, brethren, that ye abound more and more; and that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your hands, even as we have charged; *that ye may walk becomingly toward them that are without*, and may have need of nothing.[18]

---

[16] I Cor. 6:1–8.

[17] This translation of ἄτακτοι, instead of the customary "disorderly", has at least the merit of suggesting the nature of their disorder. See Frame, *ICC I Thes.*, p. 197.

[18] I Thes. 4:10–12. This custom of designating non-Christians (ἄπιστοι) as οἱ ἔξω (Mark 4:11; I Cor. 5:12, 13; Col. 4:5; I Thes. 4:12) in contrast to the Christians, saints, who were οἱ ἔσω (I Cor. 5:12), was apparently derived from the Jews, who called the heathen החיצונים, a term which Josephus, *Antt.* 15, 9, 2, translates by οἱ ἔξωθεν (cf. I Tim. 3:7).

To the Colossians he urged, "Walk in wisdom toward them that are without."[19]

While the Christian should scrupulously avoid any semblance of participation in the sins of the world, and should always realize the distinction between himself and those outside, he should be friendly in so far as he endeavored to convert them, hostile in so far as they sought to seduce him. Professor Ropes is well within the facts when he declares:

> Every body of Christians was a missionary church. Every assembly should expect and hope to be visited by the unbelieving outsider, who, when he hears the inspired Christian prophets "is judged, . . . the secrets of his heart are made manifest; and so he will fall down on his face and worship God, declaring that God is among you indeed (I Cor. 14:23 ff.)".[20]

The view that is met with occasionally even in competent scholars that the early Christian groups were not missionary in nature, but were merely awaiting the speedy appearance of the Parousia, is quite unjustified. The composition of the churches themselves, largely recruited as they were from the Gentiles, as well as the activity of Paul and of the other apostles, offer insurmountable obstacles to such a view.

Nor is a passage like II Cor. 6:14-7:1 probably to be interpreted as being opposed to a missionary spirit. Here Paul was urging the Christians not to be unequally yoked with unbelievers, since it was impossible for the two to fellowship. To enforce his argument he cited

---

[19] Col. 4:5.

[20] Ropes, *Apostolic Age*, p. 59.

Old Testament passages demanding that the people follow the true God. But Paul was not forbidding Christians to mingle with non-Christians in order to save them; rather he was urging them not to follow false leaders—that is, the *pneumatikoi* who were at the bottom of all the trouble in Corinth, who would lead them astray. Their teaching was fleshly in spite of their arrogant boast to be alone "spiritual." They must then depart from all taint of flesh and spirit.[21] Against false teaching the Christian must ever remain firm, remembering the truth of the old saying, "Evil companionships corrupt good morals."[22]

Here another point is to be observed. With Paul's constant emphasis on the innate wickedness of the world and the necessity for the Christian to steel himself to be able to take a firm stand against it and to remain "blameless and harmless, children of God without blemish in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation,"[23] there was a danger that the Christians would take him at his word and, carrying out this teaching to its logical conclusion, far beyond what Paul intended, assert their independence of all rule. They were children of the kingdom of God; why should they recognize any other king? They were free from the law; why should they obey any law? Paul realized the danger that was always menacing. Since the Christian groups were not large, they would probably not cause a national commotion, yet should they rebel they would give Christianity its deathblow. If the slaves should refuse to serve their pagan masters, measures would be taken to compel obedience. In all probability they would be executed; the numbers of the little groups, still all too few, would suffer; and the whole body of believers would be brought into disrepute, if not exterminated.

---

[21] The phrase ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος (7:1) has caused much difficulty from the time of Marcion. πνεύματος is used as a part of the old man, and hence capable of being defiled. But see p. 124. Marcion substituted αἵματος (Tertull., *adv. Marcion* v, 12). The whole section has been deleted by some, probably unwisely, although it is by no means improbable that it is a (Pauline) interpolation, perhaps a part of the "former letter." See Weiss, *Das Urchristentum*, p. 246.

[22] I Cor. 15:33. This quotation, which is from the *Thaïs* of Menander, (*Fgm.* 218, *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta* ed. Kock, iii, p. 62) had apparently become a proverb by the time of Paul. It should be compared with the somewhat similar statement in Epict., *Ench.* 33, 6: "For be assured that if one's companion be defiled he who associates with him will be defiled too, even though he himself be pure." Cf. also Epict. 3, 16, 1–16; Seneca, *de Ira* 3, 8, 1 ff.; *de Tran.* 7, 4.

key ref

SLAVERY

Nor was Paul stifling conviction for the sake of policy. There does not seem the slightest evidence that he had any quarrel with slavery. It is quite as absurd to interpret the epistle to Philemon as evidencing Paul's abolitionary views as it is to see in it a statement of his approval of slavery. The question apparently was not present in his mind. He had been familiar with slavery from his youth, both in Hebrew and in Greek associations. Aristotle had long since declared that by nature certain races were designed to be enslaved to the Hellene.[24] The comic poet, Philemon, might declare that "no one is by nature born a slave,"[25] but the consensus of opinion—or at least of practice—was against him. The Stoics did not as a rule oppose slavery, but in line with the thinkers of all the sects—Plato, Aristotle, Epicurus—urged that humanity be shown.[26] It was losing sight of the fact that the slave was a brother man that caused them concern, not his legal status. For example, Seneca in his famous forty-seventh epistle to Lucilius treats the subject fully but not from the point of view of one who favors abolition:

---

[23] Phil. 2:15.

[24] Cf. his matter-of-fact discussion in *Econ.* i, 5–1344a.

> This is, then, the sum and substance of my advice: Treat your inferiors, as you would be treated by your superiors.[27]

They were not to boast that they themselves were free, for their master had as much power over them as they had over their slaves:

> O ye, to whom the ruler of sea and land has given mighty right o'er death and life, abate your inflated and swelling pride. Whate'er a lesser fears from you, 'gainst you a greater shall threaten. All power is subject to a greater power.[28]

---

[25] Philemon, *Frg.* 95, *Com. Attic. Frg.*, ed. Kock, ii, p. 508—

κἂν δοῦλος ᾖ τις, σάρκα τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει·
φύσει γὰρ οὐδεὶς δοῦλος ἐγενήθη ποτὲ
[ἀπὸ τοῦ πάλαι πλάσαντος ἀνθρώπων γένος.
ἴσην δὲ πάντων διάθεσιν τοῦ σώματος
ἐποίησεν οὗτος ὡς ἐλευθέρου γένους.
ἐλευθέρους ἐποίησε πάντας τῇ φύσει,
δοῦλον δὲ μετεποίησεν ἡ πλεονεξιά].
ἡ δ' αὖ τύχη τὸ σῶμα κατεδουλώσατο.

[26] For a discussion of slavery in the Roman world see Lecky, *Hist. Eur. Morals*, i, pp. 300–306.

[27] *Ep. Mor.* 47, 11.

[28] Seneca, *Thyestes* 607–612. See also pp. 40 f.

Or again:

> Cruel masters are pointed at with disgust in all parts of the city and are hated and loathed.[29]

Similarly, Epictetus, while acknowledging that some were by nature appointed to a place of superiority,[30] yet reminded that slave and master were children of one father, Zeus, and that the authority of the master was never to be used tyrannically. Yet even here Epictetus seems more interested in the constant exercise of self-control—even toward slaves—than in developing any thesis concerning slavery as such.

The Hebrew law also recognized slavery, though it gave the slave rather more protection, and, in theory at least, ultimate manumission. That Paul accepted the institution as a matter of course seems obvious. Had he opposed it as Matheson[31] argues, it seems probable that to a Christian slaveowner like Philemon, he would have urged manumission even though he might have hesitated to proclaim these views abroad for fear of inciting Christian slaves to insurrection. But this he did not do. In fact, his view is quite different. Slavery or freedom—what is the difference? He who is a slave is a slave only according to the flesh. He is on a plane of equality with his master since he is the Lord's freedman.[32] The difference between bond and free lapses along with male and female, circumcision and uncircumcision.[33] When Onesimus returned to Philemon, he came as a brother since a change far more significant than manumission had been wrought. Whether Philemon would recognize this or not the fact stood.

---

[29] *de Clem.* 1, 18, 3; cf. Martial, Epigr. iii, 94.

[30] 1, 13, 3 f.; cf. Philemon, *Com. Attic. Frg.* ed. Kock, ii, p. 484—*κἂν δοῦλος ἦ τις, οὐδὲν ἧττον, δέσποτα, ἄνθρωπος οὗτός ἐστιν, ἂν ἄνθρωπος ἦ.*

[31] G. Matheson, *The Spiritual Development of St. Paul* (1893), pp. 278–297.

[32] I Cor. 7:22.

Slave and master had mutual duties and responsibilities.[34] The slave was to serve faithfully and to obey his master—whether the master was a Christian or not[35]—remembering that it was God, not a man, who would recompense and that the day was then at hand. Accordingly, they were to remain steadfast and obedient, regardless of the treatment they might receive in the short interim. To the Christian master his words were no less strict. Justice and fairness[36] must be shown, for threatening and brutal treatment on the part of the master would bring its inevitable punishment from God, for the former, too, had a master in heaven.

Though the thinkers had for centuries urged humanity to slaves, conditions seem to have grown steadily worse. The wanton cruelty practiced toward slaves in the first century is notorious even if the pandemonium described by many Christian apologists did not maintain. Seneca gives many lurid pictures, while the satirist finds it legitimate material for his irony. While slavery as an institution was never attacked in Paul, nevertheless, the note he struck so incessantly of the union of believer with believer could hardly fail to cause its ultimate downfall. Christianity's appeal was based on love rather than on philosophy or the dictates of reason, and this appeal was effective.[37]

---

[33] I Cor. 12:13; Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:11.

[34] Col. 3:22–4:1; Eph. 6:5–9.

[35] In I Tim. 6:1–2 it is expressly stated that the slave was not to presume even if the master was a fellow Christian and a brother. On the contrary, he was to respect the civil position and serve all the more faithfully (μᾶλλον δουλευέτωσαν), for the master had an even greater right under such circumstances to expect faithful service. The presumption is that such a command was to check abuses actually existing and not those that might arise in the future.

[36] Col. 4:1.

N'S ATTIT.
ROMAN
OVT.

But more important than the matter of slavery was the question of the Christian's attitude toward the Roman government. It is quite probable that the question of loyalty to Cæsar and of the payment of taxes, which was a sore point for many Jews, had its effect on the Christians also, particularly Jewish Christians. The Roman Jews had the name of being a turbulent group, and lately had been expelled from Rome as brawlers, or at least had suffered a drastic curtailment of their privileges.[38] The grave danger of converting liberty into license and freedom from law into lawlessness was ever before Paul's mind. In the latter part of the epistle to the Romans[39] he explained the duty of the Christian toward the state. Strict obedience was enjoined on the basis that all lasting government had the divine sanction; all opposition to it was opposition to God himself.

---

[37] See also p. 41.

[38] With the well-known but puzzling statement of Suetonius (*Claudius* 25), "Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultantes Roma expulit," which is supposed to be confirmed by Acts 18:2, should be compared the express statement of Dio Cassius (*Hist.* lx, 6, 6) that Claudius contented himself with prohibiting their assemblies and did not venture their expulsion for fear of the consequent tumult. For earlier expulsions from Rome see Valerius Maximus, i, 3, 2; Tacitus, *Annal.* ii, 85; Suetonius, *Tiberius* 36; Josephus, *Antt.* 18, 3, 5.

[39] Rom. 13:1–7.

The state was of divine origin, ordained by God for the punishment of evil-doers. But for those who were living as they should, far from being a terror, the magistrate was actually a minister of God himself to avenge them when wronged. Obedience was to be granted not alone because any failure in this respect would bring certain retribution, but because it was right and because conscience demanded it. Whether or not he knew the tradition of Jesus' words, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's,"[40] Paul's teaching was identical. Taxes as well as the other duties devolving upon the Christian for his share in the upkeep of the government were sacred obligations, and must be met as such. This principle went hand in hand with his prophylactic motive of ever guarding the church from Rome's suspicion. Paul was a man who could always see a practical advantage from doing right.

It has often been wondered how Paul could speak so favorably of the Roman government. It must be remembered that, although a Jew, Paul was a free-born Roman citizen.[41] Again and again the Roman power had saved him from the angry mob of his fellow countrymen. The benefits of the *Pax Romana* were everywhere to be seen.

> Through their instrumentality the world is at peace, and we walk on the highways without fear, and sail where we will,

wrote Irenæus[42] a few decades later. Paul might well remember his experience before Gallio at Corinth, when the Roman fairness saved him from the mob. Indeed, Ramsay makes this episode a turning-point in his thought:

---

[40] Mark 12:17 and parallels. For further discussion see pp. 115 f.

[41] See p. 11, n. 28.

[42] *adv. Haer.* iv, 30, 3.

> St. Paul's experience in Corinth of the favour of the Roman courts as a defence against the Jews seems to have produced a powerful effect on his thought and teaching. The event divides the two letters to the Thessalonians by a deep chasm from the group of Galatians, Corinthians, Romans. There is a remarkable change of feeling as we pass from one group to the other.[43]

If, however, as seems probable, Galatians is to be dated before Thessalonians, the "chasm" should not be dug too deep. On the whole, Rome's treatment gave the Christians little ground for just complaint. Later persecutions and garbled accounts have conspired to give an entirely erroneous picture of the character of Roman rule.[44] It was from the Jews, not from the Romans, that Paul met his greatest opposition.

Whether or not Paul felt the danger in his churches of incipient uprisings against Rome similar to those of Judas the Gaulonite[45] and Theudas[46] and Eleazar,[47] the fact remains that the Christian teachings when exaggerated were calculated to breed a very dangerous antinomianism on the part of the Christians against Rome. That this occurred as early as the time of Pliny is sure.

> Many Christian confessors went to extremes in showing their contempt and hatred for their judges; and the *Acta* fully explain the indignation which their conduct roused in Pliny, conscious as

---

[43] Ramsay, *The Church in the Roman Empire* (1892), p. 247, note.

[44] *Ibid.*, p. 350.

[45] Josephus, *Antt.* 18, 1, 1.

[46] *Ibid.* 20, 5, 1.

[47] Josephus, *Wars* 7, 8, 6.

he was of his own lofty motives, and of the wisdom of the Imperial policy. Their answers to plain questions were evasive and indirect; they lectured Roman dignitaries as if the latter were the criminals and they themselves the judges; and they even used violent reproaches and coarse insulting gestures.[48]

It seems extremely probable that Paul feared just this danger. Not only the priests of Isis[49], but Jews[50] had already been expelled from Rome; might not the Christians be next? This fear may well have contributed to Paul's anxiety to prevent the Christians doing anything to arouse suspicion or persecution. The knowledge that even he had occasionally been arrested by Roman officers was well calculated to fan Christian hatred of Rome to the danger point, or at least to insolence that could not fail to bring swift retribution.

Seneca, ever the patron of good government, continually stressed the folly of revolutionary violence:

> Just so long will this people be spared that danger [*i.e.*, the destruction of the *pax Romana* and the overthrow of the nation] as it knows how to bear the reins. Should it ever break them or refuse to have them replaced if shaken off by some mishap, then this unity and this fabric of mightiest empire will fly into many pieces, and the end of this city's rule will be the day upon which it forgets to obey.[51]

No less abhorrent to Paul, ever the man of culture and refinement, in spite of his life of privation and self-imposed hardship, were insurrection and violence. The apostle of liberty was no less the apostle of order and subordination. But in addition to his instinctive aversion to all that outraged his sensibilities was the recognition that any such disturbance could end only in abortive disaster. All this gave force to his insistence that consecration to Christ did not invalidate the Christians' allegiance and loyalty to the government whose blessings they were enjoying, but that, on the contrary, it should deepen them. Faithfulness to this duty, having as it did the sanction of conscience, was an important element in walking worthily of the gospel.[52]

---

[48] Ramsay, *op. cit.*, p. 374, note.
[49] Josephus, *Antt.* 18, 3, 4.
[50] P. 210, n. 38.
[51] *de Clem.* 1, 4, 2.

Nor was his emphasis on obedience and submission limited to the relations of Christians to the Roman government. The Christians were to be in submission to their spiritual authorities. Though the churches seem still to have been in the period of informal and voluntary leadership as regards the local officers,[53] Paul constantly demanded obedience to constituted authority of whatever nature it might be. The Corinthians' disregard of his authority was a sore point with him. While not desiring to lord it over them,[54] he expected implicit obedience. Indeed, his strictness had caused some to feel that in spite of his protestations he had assumed far too domineering a tone. He might be merely the representative of Christ, as he told the Thessalonians,[55] yet the iron hand was beneath the velvet glove. If the loafers at Thessalonica refused to heed his exhortations and continued in disobedience, they were to be punished, though in love. Quite casually, as he was recommending Mark to Colossæ,[56] he mentioned the "commandments" they had received from him. To Philemon, though he preferred "for love's sake" to entreat him, he did not hesitate to make clear that he had a perfect right to utter a definite command.[57] Indeed, he was confident that Philemon would be obedient.[58] A parallel, by no means uninstructive, may be seen in the groups of the Pythagoreans and Orphics, where the phrase *αὐτὸς ἔφη*—*i.e.*, "the master said it"—was final.[59] In the later monasticism the oath of obedience became one of the three requirements.

---

[52] Similarly, the author of I Tim. exhorts "Timothy" to pray for "kings and all that are in high place; that we may lead a tranquil and quiet life in all godliness and gravity" (I Tim. 2:1 f.); *cf.* Tit. 3:1; I Pet. 2:13–17; I Clem. 61:1–3; and often in the apologists.

[53] Cf. McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, pp. 645–672, esp. pp. 666 ff. For a recent study of the origins of the Christian ministry see Streeter, *The Primitive Church* (1929).

[54] II Cor. 1:24.

Whether his word to the Philippians, "Even as ye have always obeyed,"[60] understands "me" or "God" is, after all, as unimportant as it is obscure. The general state of being in obedience is what the apostle was commending. The obedience of slaves to masters,[61] of wives to husbands,[62] of children to parents,[63] of Christians[64] to faith, to the gospel, to God are constantly demanded by the apostle. Jesus himself he can describe without affectation as "becoming obedient unto death."[65] If any of the words of the speeches attributed to Paul by the author of Acts are historical, it is his proud word to Agrippa, "I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision."[66] His was a life-long obedience.

---

[55] I Thes. 4:1, 2.

[56] Col. 4:10.

[57] Philm. 8 ff.; cf. the formal phrase τοιοῦτος ὢν ὡς Παῦλος πρεσβύτης κτλ; also ἐγὼ Παῦλος, Gal. 5:2; Eph. 3:1.

[58] Philm. 21.

[59] Diog. Laert. viii, 46; Schol. Aristoph. *Nub.* 195; Cic., *de Nat. D.* i, 5, 10; Quin. *Inst. Orat.*, xi, 1, 27; Clem. Al., *Strom.* ii, 5; Philo, *Quaest. in Genesin* i, 99: Orig., *c. Cels.* i, 7.

[60] Phil. 2:12.

[61] Col. 3:22; Eph. 6:5.

[62] Col. 3:18; Eph. 5:22, 24, 33; cf. I Cor. 14:34 f.

[63] Col. 3:20; Eph. 6:1.

[64] Rom. 1:5; 6:16, 17; 8:7; 10:3, 16; 16:19, 26; II Cor. 7:15; 10:5, 6; Eph. 5:21; II Thes. 1:8; 3:14; and often.

But though Paul well realized the impossibility of entirely isolating his churches from the outside world, and, sensing the danger that might arise from abortive attempts in that direction, stressed the essential need of obedience and respect for all authority, yet this never weakened his conviction that, after all, the Christians were sojourning in a hostile world and were subject to all manner of temptations. The life to which they had been called was not an easy one. None better than Paul realized the suffering and the persecution that would come in this constant warfare against sin. In all this they were to stand firm. Hardly any word used by the apostle is more characteristic of him than the frequent στήκετε "stand firm."

key to chptr

The statement is often made that the characteristic note of Stoicism was fortification; of Christianity, edification. The distinction is on the whole accurate. Seneca sounds the note:

---

[65] Phil. 2:8.

[66] Acts 26:19.

> Fortune lashes and mangles us; well, let us endure it. It is not cruelty, it is a struggle in which the oftener we engage the braver we shall become.[67]

Again his description of the storm-beaten tree reveals the wise man in his struggle against the temptations of life:

> No tree which the wind does not often blow against is firm and strong, for it is stiffened by the very act of being shaken, and plants its roots the more securely.[68]

The true Stoic felt a thrill as alone he pitted himself against the world. Come what might, nothing would cause him to yield. His head might be bloody, but it would be unbowed.

While for Paul the struggle was never for the sake of struggling—as it too often became for the Stoic—it was no less real. The note of fortification is as strong in his writings as it is in those of Seneca, but with this difference. For the Stoic, with but few exceptions, this struggle on earth to attain tranquillity[69] was all there was in life. The goal was the realization of a complete mastery over temptation and with no ulterior end in view. It was right, virtue demanded it—that was sufficient. For Paul the fight was severe, the suffering real, but they were only of a short duration. The day of victory was at hand. In the interim the saint should strengthen himself to avoid the only real disaster he need fear, losing the glorious hope of final acquittal, of appearing faultless in the presence of the Lord.

---

[67] *de Prov.* 4, 12.

[68] *Ibid.* 4, 16.

[69] The ideal was ἀπάθεια. See pp. 22 ff.; 306, n. 46.

To the Corinthians he wrote:

> Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, immovable;[70]

or again:

> Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.[71]

To the Philippians:

> So stand fast in the Lord.[72]

Christians had been called to freedom in Christ; in that glorious state they were to stand firm.[73] That the Colossians should stand firm and perfect had been the endeavor of Epaphras, the faithful slave of Christ.[74] The Christians are counseled to put on the panoply of God in order that they may be able to stand firm against all the assaults of the devil and after having done all that they may remain standing firm.[75] Yet vigilance is necessary, for he that thinketh he standeth need take watch lest he fall.[76] It was not enough to have made the start; they must continue to the end without being weary in well-doing.[77] If they stood fast in the Lord, life was theirs.[78]

---

[70] I Cor. 15:58.

[71] I Cor. 16:13. A quite remarkable parallel to this verse is found in Seneca (*de Const. Sap.* 19, 3), "Though you are hard pressed and set upon by cruel force, it is a disgrace to retreat. Hold the post assigned to you by nature (cf. στήκετε). Do you ask what post this is? It is that of being a man (*viri;* cf. ἀνδρίζεσθε). With these words of Paul should also be compared I Macc. 2:64.

[72] Phil. 4:1.

[73] Gal. 5:1; cf. II Thes. 2:15.

[74] Col. 4:12.

[75] Eph. 6:10–20.

[76] I Cor. 10:12.

[77] Gal. 6:9; Phil. 1:27; Col. 1:23; II Thes. 3:13.

[78] I Thes. 3:8.

Courage, bravery, and manliness are as truly characteristic of Paul's ethics as of the Stoic's. It is interesting to observe that Paul never mentions the classic tetrad of virtues, which from the days of Plato had been the law and the prophets to all Greek ethical thought regardless of school: φρόνησις or σοφία, ἀνδρεία, σωφροσύνη, and δικαιοσύνη. In the Wisdom of Solomon σοφία is recognized as the root of all the virtues and is practically identified with the "Spirit of God;" her fruits, however, are the classic four: temperance, prudence, justice, and fortitude.[79] Similarly, IV Maccabees evidences Stoic influence, while Philo finds (allegorically) in the four streams that encompassed Eden an indication of these four cardinal virtues.[80] But in Paul there is no evidence of his having been influenced by them in the slightest degree. σοφία (wisdom) he does use, but directly states that this σοφία in which the Greeks prided themselves caused them to regard the cross of Christ as foolishness.[81] δικαιοσύνη is a key word for Paul, but its meaning is quite the reverse of that which it had in the Greek world. While given by Paul an entirely unique significance, its associations are with the Septuagint and not with the Hellenistic world.[82] *σωφροσύνη* (temperance) he never uses, though, forms of the verb *σωφρονέω* occur twice—once in the sense, "to put a moderate estimate upon oneself" in contrast to *ὑπερφρονεῖν*,[83] and once of "being in one's sound mind" in contrast to those who are "beside themselves" (*ἐξέστημεν*).[84] *ἀνδρεία* (fortitude, bravery) does not occur in the New Testament at all.[85] Evidence such as this of a complete ignorance or entire disregard of the fundamentals of a system causes one to view with suspicion attempts to explain agreements—even though they may be striking—as betokening conscious dependence.

---

[79] Wisdom of Solomon, 8:7—

> σωφροσύνην γὰρ καὶ φρόνησιν ἐκδιδάσκει [*sc.* ἣ σοφία],
> δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀνδρείαν,
> ὧν χρησιμώτερον οὐδέν ἐστιν ἐν βίῳ ἀνθρώποις.

[80] *Legg. Alleg.* i, 19–23 (§§63–73) 56–58M.

[81] I Cor. 1:21 ff.; 2:1, 4, 5, 13; 3:19; II Cor. 1:12; Col. 2:23; cf. also p. 34. In contrast with this disparagement of earthly wisdom he speaks of a divine wisdom, almost equivalent to knowledge of the divine plan of salvation (I Cor. 1:24, 30; 2:6, 7; Eph. 1:8, 17; 3:10; Col. 1:9), which thus may be said to be hidden in Christ (Col. 2:3). Once it is used of the supreme intelligence of God (Rom. 11:33). It is also used of prudence in intercourse with non-Christians (Col. 4:5) and of skill in imparting Christian truth (Col. 1:28; 3:16).

In Paul bravery, as an abstract virtue, is never praised. Rather Christians were constantly exhorted to stand firm. As they contended against opposition it was to be without timidity or fearfulness.[86] Toward God fear in the sense of reverence was a virtue, but toward sin and the opponents of the Christian group steadfast courage was the virtue. The phrase "fear and trembling"[87] did not express any sign of weakness or of cowardice awakened by opposition, but apparently was of the type of favorite expression, more or less stereotyped in form, which, though in the main suggesting the intense anxiety to do right, is not to be forced to yield the exact meaning of the separate words themselves.

---

[82] In the Greek world it meant "justice" or "just deserts"; oftener, in the sense "condemnation." For Paul it was nearly equivalent to "acquittal." For an excellent discussion see J. H. Ropes, " 'Righteousness' and 'The Righteousness of God' in the Old Testament and in St. Paul," *Journ. Bibl. Lit.* (1903), vol. xxii, part ii, pp. 211–227.

[83] Rom. 12:3.

[84] II Cor. 5:13. In the Pastorals *σωφροσύνη* occurs twice (I Tim. 2:9, 15), while *σωφρόνιμος* (II Tim. 1:7), *σωφρόνως* (Tit. 2:12), *σωφρών* (I Tim. 3:2; Tit. 1:8; 2:2, 5), and forms of *σωφρονέω* (Tit. 2:6) and *σωφρονίζω* (Tit. 2:4) are found.

[85] For the single occurrence of a form of *ἀνδρίζομαι* see p. 218, n. 71.

[86] *E.g.*, Phil. 1:28.

[87] *φόβος καὶ τρόμος*—II Cor. 2:3; 7:15; Eph. 6:5; Phil. 2:12.

Courage finds its greatest expression in the virtue of *ὑπομονή*.[88] To a certain degree this corresponds to the Platonic virtue, *ἀνδρεία*—that is, courage or fortitude which evidences valor against the foes of the soul; but for Paul it is more than that. It is the "characteristic of a man who is unswerved from his deliberate purpose and his loyalty to faith and piety by even the greatest trials and sufferings" (Thayer). All other meanings for Paul—if indeed they exist at all—are secondary. Attempts to classify this as a passive virtue are thus mistaken. It was not the attitude of uncomplaining patience of the man who bowed his head in resignation. Rather it was the characteristic of the martyr who refused to yield though his life must pay the penalty. The episode described in Acts 23:1 ff. exemplifies this virtue. Paul is testifying before the Sanhedrin and is struck on the mouth by order of Ananias. It could hardly be said that his retort, "God shall smite thee, thou whited wall: and sittest thou to judge me according to the law, and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?" showed a spirit of "uncomplaining patience," but rather steadfast and unyielding fidelity to the truth and loyalty to his Lord regardless of the personal penalty.[89] Chrysostom's characterization of ὑπομονή as "queen of the virtues" (βασιλὶς τῶν ἀρετῶν)[90] is much more accurate than his comment: "One endures those whom he cannot requite."[91] The Christian might conceivably avoid the suffering by basely yielding, but he was not to desire to do so. He was to meet the suffering with joy in his heart. He might be "down," but he was not "out" (καταβαλλόμενοι ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπολλύμενοι).[92]

---

[88] A full discussion of the use and history of this word is to be found in Ropes, *ICC James*, pp. 135–137.

Suffering was not to be looked upon solely as an evidence of God's displeasure. This the Jew had seen long before. The old orthodox view that the book of Job attacked, namely, that a great sufferer must of necessity be a great sinner, had given way gradually, in spite of abundant biblical warrant, to the more satisfactory view of the rabbis (also found in the Old Testament itself) that suffering was a proof of God's favor.

> My son, despise not the chastening of Jehovah; neither be weary of his reproof: for whom Jehovah loveth he reproveth, even as a father the son in whom he delighteth.[93]

Of course the distinction was made between the outrageous sinner who was merely getting his just deserts and the pious man who was nevertheless afflicted. Israel will be chastized for her sins more severely than the other nations for theirs. All this was a proof of God's fatherly love and care for Israel. Only through her suffering could she obtain the greatest gifts from heaven. Indeed, that suffering atoned for all was a favorite and often repeated teaching of the later rabbis.[94] Affliction reconciled and attached the son to the father—that is, Israel to God. And it was a rabbinic commonplace that the man who went forty days without trouble was past hope, since this was a sure sign that God had given him up in despair.[95]

---

[89] This is not meant to raise the question of the historical value of the response or of the incident as a whole.

[90] *Epist.* vii, 4 "Dominæ Meæ," *Opera* ed. Montfaucon iii, 707 (588D).

[91] ὑπομένει (*sc.* τις) δὲ οὓς οὐ δύνατος ἀμύνασθαι—*Hom.* ii, 2 on Col., *ed. cit.*, xi, 385 (335A).

[92] II Cor. 4:9.

[93] Prov. 3:11 f.; cf. Deut. 8:5; Psalm 94:12; Job 5:17; Psalms of Solomon 10:1–3; and often.

It is interesting to observe that, turning to Seneca, we can duplicate these views of Judaism.

> No one seems to me more unhappy than the man on whom no misfortune has ever fallen.[96]
>
> I think you unhappy because you have never been unhappy.[97]
>
> Between good men and the gods there is a friendship which is brought about by virtue. Friendship, do I say? Nay, rather relationship (*necessitudo*) and likeness, since a good man differs from a god in nothing save time alone. He is his pupil and imitator and true offspring, whom that glorious parent, no gentle taskmaster of virtues, trains the more severely just as strict fathers do. . . . He does not pamper a good man; he tests him, hardens him, and fits him for himself.[98]

And yet these illustrations should be read in their contexts. It is preëminently the Stoic who is speaking. The Epicurean may strive to reduce suffering to its minimum; the Stoic welcomes it, but at the same time denies its existence.

---

[94] For a full discussion of expiatory suffering and chastisement see Moore, *Judaism*, i, pp. 546–552; ii, pp. 248–256.

[95] Arakin 16b.

[96] *de Prov.* 3, 3.

[97] *Ibid.* 4, 3.

[98] *Ibid.* 1, 5 f.

Paul's view of suffering rang true to his Jewish heritage. It was no sign of sin, but, on the contrary, was what the Christian must expect in his struggle for the right. All life was a struggle. Indeed, to the Galatians he could say, "Did ye suffer so many things in vain?"[99] We have no real ground for assuming that there had been any special persecution in Galatia. Rather these words seem to reveal Paul's normal outlook on life. The Christian life at its best was an uphill struggle—worth while, but desperately hard. His life had been one of the most intense suffering. His own experiences of persecution, hardships, and of imprisonment might have seemed to the older Greek, with his view that one deserved the treatment one received, a sign that he was under the wrath of heaven.

Not so Paul. Fearing that his opponents in Thessalonica were whispering just this and were insinuating that their neighbors' sufferings might well indicate that the gospel which they had accepted was futile, Paul reminded the church that he had constantly affirmed that conformity to the life worthy of the gospel must of necessity bring suffering, and that they too must expect persecution. The steadfastness which they had shown, and which was such a source of pride to Paul, was the guaranty (ἔνδειγμα)[100] of the righteous judgment of God toward them. No longer need they be faint-hearted nor apprehensive of future salvation. Their constancy in the face of severe testing had revealed their true nature. Far from being an evidence of their error, it afforded a proof of their righteousness (cf. also II Cor. 4:17; Rom. 5:3). Even Jesus and the prophets had gone the same way.[101] The words, "for yourselves know that hereunto [*i.e.*, to afflictions] we are appointed,"[102] are not improbably to be interpreted as a general statement of the nature of the Christian life.

---

[99] Gal. 3:4. For a full discussion of the perplexing words τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῇ see Burton, *ICC Gal.*, pp. 149 ff.

[100] II Thes. 1:5.

As the saint was actually in Christ, the challenge that life afforded enabled him to realize his highest dignity. He was privileged to suffer for Christ; more, he actually participated in Christ's suffering.[103] Here again the contrast between Paul and the Stoics is revealed. The latter rejected the thought of showing pity for the man who was subject to suffering, for actually the suffering was of no consequence. Nothing could destroy his equanimity. For Paul, on the contrary, the suffering was very real, but it came from God and should be recognized as a real gift of grace. To the Colossians he wrote:

> Now I rejoice in my sufferings for your sake, and fill up on my part that which is lacking of the afflictions of Christ in my flesh for his body's sake, which is the church.[104]

This verse is usually interpreted to mean that Christ had not undergone all the suffering in the Passion that he must endure, and that Paul bore the remainder that

---

[101] I Thes. 2:15.

[102] I Thes. 3:3.

[103] Phil. 1:29.

[104] Col. 1:24.

Christ had not borne. Deissmann[105] has recently suggested, that *τοῦ Χριστοῦ* is not a subjective but a "mystical" genitive, and that the phrase really means: "I, Paul, as a member of the body of Christ have a certain amount of suffering to bear; I have borne much, but still some more remains to be borne." Thus the phrase really equals: "I suffer, yet not I but Christ suffers in me."

Whichever interpretation is adopted, one point is clear: suffering was the law of life. For Paul, as for every other Jew, the death of the Jewish Messiah had been a stumbling-block. The conception that Israel must undergo the suffering of chastisement was, as we have seen, perfectly familiar, but that God would let his Messiah suffer indignities at the hands of the uncircumcised was inconceivable.[106] Paul's conversion had been that he had come to see that, after all, Jesus, in spite of his shameful death, bore the especial stamp of God's approval. But Paul's thought did not stop there.

In the course of his unfolding experience, as he came to the realization of the fundamental place that suffering held in life—and his own life was calculated to bring this truth home—it was no far step to feel that Jesus was what he was, no longer in spite of his sufferings, but because of them. The completeness of the sacrifice—one life laid down for all—attested the truth of Jesus' claim.[107] There could be but one result. Not only was this true for the Lord, but it was true for every Christian who had come into mystical union with him: the way to glory was through suffering. The greatest goal in life then became to know "the power of his resurrection, and *the fellowship of his sufferings*."[108] The fundamental characteristic of Jesus' life had been self-denial and renunciation. For the Christian to be truly conformed to his Lord this note must be prominent in his life, too. Then the lyric note of Rom. 8. The Stoic could counsel, "Bear and forbear," and to the question, "Why?" would answer, "It is your duty." For Paul it was very different. The struggle was awful, the very forces of the devil were arrayed against the Christians; but what of that? God was for them. What could the opposition do? The victory was assured. With his gaze on the future reward he could say with perfect confidence, "The sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed."[109]

---

[105] A. Deissmann, *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, pp. 233–241.

[106] That Judaism had a doctrine of a suffering Messiah cannot be substantiated by evidence, although it has often been asserted. To be sure, in a mediæval Midrash (Pesiḳta Rabbati 36) is to be found a compact between God and the Messiah at the creation, in which the Messiah agrees to endure the sufferings that are set before him on condition that no Israelite shall ever perish. This passage, however, which is "palpably an appropriation of Christian doctrine for a Jewish Messiah," bears no witness to the views of rabbinic Judaism (Moore, *Judaism*, i, pp. 551 f.).

Afflictions,[110] which were present in the life of every Christian, were powerless in the end; neither they nor anything else could separate the saint from the love of Christ.[111] The Christians would meet the subtler forms of temptations, yet the same attitude of uncompromising loyalty and fidelity to the moral character they bore must be observed. No compromise was possible, nor could excuses be accepted. The temptation was never more than could be borne. God never tested men beyond their power.[112]

---

[107] Nor should it be forgotten that for the mystery cults as well it was through suffering that the lord had become possessed of the secret and was thus enabled to share it with his votaries.

[108] Phil. 3:10.

[109] Rom. 8:18.

[110] *θλίψις* was for Paul a common word characterizing the Christian life. Among other passages, cf. Rom. 5:3; 8:35; 12:12; II Cor. 1:4, 8; 2:4; 4:17; 6:4; 7:4; 8:2; Eph. 3:13; Phil. 4:14; Col. 1:24; I Thes. 1:6; 3:3, 7; II Thes. 1:4.

Here the case of Paul's own affliction may be instructive—the baffling "thorn in the flesh,"[113] concerning which much has been written but little known. Blindness, epilepsy, and various other disorders of both mind and body have all been suggested, but though each satisfies some of the symptoms, each is open to question. From this passage there seems a fair possibility that the "thorn" was in the nature of some temptation against which his whole life was a fight. Three times he had prayed for its removal—fearful that he would at last succumb?—but in each case had come the answer, "My grace is sufficient for thee." The apparent meaning is: "My grace is sufficient to keep you from falling; the thorn itself is valuable as a preventative of excessive pride." If the nature of the affliction was a constant temptation, it might well have contributed to his almost fanatical desire to be in Christ, to escape from his own members, and, as has been suggested,[114] might possibly yield a side light on Paul's intense and lasting hostility to sins of a sexual character. But it must be frankly stated that this is only the barest hypothesis—though one which seems on the whole not improbable to the present writer—and that no argument or conclusion should be based upon it, since direct evidence is wholly lacking. With this warning it may be suggestive.

---

[111] Rom. 8:35.

[112] I Cor. 10:13. Cf. Philo, *de Spec. Legg.* i (*de Sacrific.*) 8 (§299) 257M, "For he [*i.e.*, the lawgiver] says, 'O mind of man, God demands nothing of you which is oppressive, or uncertain, or difficult, but only such things as are very simple and easy.'"

[113] II Cor. 12:7–9.

Nor was passive refusal to yield all that was demanded of the Christian. It was not sufficient to refrain from becoming partners with those whose morals were lax, "to have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness." In addition, active aggression was necessary. The secret deeds of shame must be resolutely exposed (ἐλέγχετε).[115] Paul was primarily the soldier. Life was a battle to be fought as well as a race to be run. With Seneca he could exclaim: "To live, Lucilius, is to fight."[116] Epaphroditus[117] and Archippus[118] were "fellow soldiers." Andronicus and Junias,[119] Aristarchus[120] and Epaphras[121] were his fellow prisoners of war. The Christians were to put on the whole armor of God, and not for defense alone; with the sword of the spirit they were to wage a continual warfare against evil.[122] In II Cor.

---

[114] Pp. 191 f.

[115] Eph. 5:7–14. For meaning "expose" for ἐλέγχετε (v. 11) instead of "reprove" or "convict" see Abbott, *ICC Eph.* in loc. pp. 154 f.

[116] *Ep. Mor.* 96, 5 cf. Epict. 3, 24, 34.

[117] Phil. 2:25.

[118] Philm. 2.

[119] Rom. 16:7.

[120] Col. 4:10.

[121] Philm. 23.

[122] Eph. 6:10–20.

10:3 ff. his work is likened to warfare, and the picture drawn is decidedly grim of the attack the Christians were to make, tearing down the strongholds and high towers of sin. I Thes. 5:8, II Cor. 6:7, probably Phil. 1:28 continue the same figure, and reveal the positive note of conquest demanded by Paul. Sin was of the nature to negate Christ's death; it must be fought to the death.[123]

---

[123] Dibelius (Lietzmann's *Handb. Eph.*, pp. 122–123) summarizes similar material, mentioning both the mythical accounts of the arming and fighting of the gods and the favorite concept of the pious man as a soldier of his god, and citing several pertinent illustrations.

One more may be added. In an appendix to Jane Harrison's *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, pp. 672 ff. Gilbert Murray quotes the text of a gold tablet of Cæcilia Secundina of the first or second century of the Christian era, discovered in a Roman tomb in 1899:

> *ἔρχεται ἐκ καθαρῶν, καθαρὰ χθονίων βασίλεια, Εὔκλεες Εὐβουλεῦ τε. Διὸς*
> *τέκος ὅπλα δ'ἔχ' ὧδε Μνημοσύνης (τὸ δὲ δῶρον ἀοίδιμον ἀνθρώποισιν)*
> *Καικιλία Σεκουνδεῖνα νόμῳ ἀεὶ ἀπαγωγά.*

Upon it Murray comments: "The peculiar use of *ὅπλα*, to which I can find nothing similar in our fragments of Orphic literature, had its exact parallel in St. Paul's repeated metaphors, *ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης* (Rom. 6:13; II Cor. 6:7), *ὅπλα φωτός* (Rom. 13:12). The 'armour of Mnemosyne' to an Orphic would probably bear just the same shade of meaning as the 'armour of light' to a Christian. Lethe was the Orphic 'Darkness.'" (I have taken the liberty of correcting the references to the New Testament, two out of the three having been printed incorrectly.)

ANTI-SOCIAL
SINS OF A SELFISH NATURE

To the church at Corinth Paul wrote, "Let all things be done unto edifying."[1] Under this figure of speech was stressed the third of the underlying principles of the ethical teachings of Paul: edification, the act of promoting another's growth in the Christian graces. As has been pointed out in an earlier chapter,[2] one of the greatest contributions that Paul made was that of giving to Christianity a lasting solidarity by his emphasis on the social ties linking saint to saint. Not alone was the individual to keep himself free and separate from all that would defile, and to meet with steadfastness all the temptations and suffering that might come, but he was to live and act in such a way that his brethren might also attain. Paul's own great purpose in life was to present all men perfect in Christ.[3] To attain this end he was glad to sacrifice his own freedom and to enslave himself to all, that by his unselfish devotion he might win the more for Christ.[4] Accordingly, it would be impossible to understand Paul's moral teaching without seeing its essentially social nature.

To the saints had come a wonderful transforming experience. Unlike all other men, they had passed from death to life. Unlike the Jew, enslaved to a fleshly law, they had been freed through union with a risen Lord; unlike the Gentile, enslaved to sin and alienated from God, they had been graciously called to fellowship with God himself. They were to participate in the eternal destiny of the world. This could not fail to give a community of interest. Each was to recognize not alone that he was different from all those to whom this secret of eternal fellowship with Christ had not been granted, but also that he was united by the most intimate ties with his fellows in the faith. The Christian church was a unit; every member must live for the rest. A sin committed against the brethren or the individual brother was a sin against Christ,[5] against the common life circulating through them all, for the church as a whole continued the life of Christ.

---

[1] I Cor. 14:26.
[2] Pp. 72 ff. and often.
[3] Col. 1:28.
[4] I Cor. 9:19 ff.

The law of the spirit, the badge that they had passed from death to life, made them one; it was the law in their members that separated and tended to make them many. To the man in Christ social duties were no longer due to external commands—he was free from them—but due to the constraining love of Christ which resulted from identification of self and purpose with him. So for Paul the whole law was fulfilled by love: "Owe no man anything, save to love another: for he that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law."[6] The church was one body, filled with one Spirit, baptized into the name of one Lord; all were children of the one Father, though having different functions and duties.[7] Walking worthily of their calling actually consisted in promoting and continuing this perfect fellowship. This could be achieved only as each member realized his connection with the whole. The virtues to be practiced were those of an essentially social nature: "lowliness, and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love; giving diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace."[8] To the Colossians he wrote:

---

[5] I Cor. 8:12.

[6] Rom. 13:8; see below pp. 240 f.

> Put on therefore, as God's elect, holy and beloved, a heart of compassion, kindness, lowliness, meekness, longsuffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving each other, if any man have a complaint against any; even as the Lord forgave you, so also do ye: and above all these things put on love, which is the bond of perfectness.[9]

It is to be noted that the two sins of stealing and lying are forbidden precisely because of their anti-social nature. Instead of stealing, whereby the brother is harmed, the new man is to do just the reverse; he is to labor that he may have enough honestly acquired to contribute to another's need.[10] Again, ". . . putting away falsehood, speak ye truth each one with his neighbor, for we are members one with another."[11] Although not the only objection to these sins, it was a sufficient one.

Nor was Paul unique in this stressing of the common tie linking Christians together. The Stoics had taught the doctrine of the solidarity of men for generations. If Paul constantly compared Christians to members of a body, [12] Livy, Cicero, Seneca, Marcus Aurelius all used the same figure;[13] but with Paul it was not merely a comparison, but a mystical truth. The Christians were not *like* members of a body; they actually *were* members of a body. Sometimes the body was Christ; at other times he is represented as the head of the body. Paul is never completely happy in his use of metaphors, yet the nature of his thought is always clear.

---

[7] Eph. 4:1 ff.
[8] Eph. 4:2 f.
[9] Col. 3:12–14.
[10] Eph. 4:28.
[11] Eph. 4:25; cf. Col. 3:9.

Especially was this a favorite figure with Seneca:

> All this which thou seest, in which are comprised things divine and human, is one. We are members of a great body (*membra sumus corporis magni*). Nature made us kin when she bore us from the same things and for the same end.[14]

Or again:

> What if the hands were to wish to hurt the feet, or the eyes to hurt the hands? As all the limbs act in harmony, because it is the interest of the whole body to keep each one of them safe, so men share with another, because they are born for society (*quia ad coetum geniti sunt*). The bond of society, however, cannot exist unless it guards and loves all its members.[15]

In the curious so-called contest of Homer and Hesiod, in reply to the latter's question: "Of what effect are righteousness and courage?" Homer had answered, "To advance the common good by private pains."[16] This note was constantly repeated. Nor must the Stoic be charged with undue severity. Precisely that charge was made to Seneca, who took pains to refute it:

---

[12] Cf. also pp. 74 f., 95, 127, 133.

[13] Cf. Lietzmann, *Handb. I Kor.* 12:12 and the numerous citations in Wettstein in loc.

[14] *Ep. Mor.* 95, 52; cf. Epict. 2, 5, 24–29; 2, 10, 4; 2, 23, 7; M. Aurel. 2, 1; 7, 13; Xen., *Mem.* ii, 3, 18.

[15] *de Ira* 2, 31, 7; *de Otio* 3 (30), 5.

> But no school of philosophy is more gentle and more benignant [*sc.* than the Stoics], none is more full of love toward man or more anxious to promote the common good, seeing that its maxims are, "to be of service and assistance to others, and to consult the interests of each and all, not of itself alone."[17]

But though Paul's thinking—and often his imagery—can be paralleled by contemporary pagan thought, there was a decided difference. Seneca could speak of love toward all men, but this love was a completely impersonal feeling; indeed, it was essentially negative. In speaking of the various virtues—bravery, loyalty, temperance, even kindliness—this negative note is sounded:

> Kindliness (*humanitas*) *forbids* you to be overbearing toward your associates, and it *forbids* you to be grasping. In words and in deeds and in feelings it shows itself gentle and courteous to all men.[18]

As the ideal for life Epictetus could desire a student to say:

> I desire to be free from passion and quite unmoved (ἀπαθὴς εἶναι καὶ ἀτάραχος); and as a pious man and a philosopher and diligent in life I desire to know my duty to the gods, my parents, my brethren, my country, and to strangers.

To him who can truthfully say that there is but one response possible:

> O man, thou art a god; thou hast great designs.[19]

---

[16] *Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, p. 320 (Göttling).

[17] *de Clem.* 2, 5, 3.

[18] *Ep. Mor.* 88, 30.

[19] 2, 17, 31–33.

This is a fair example of the calm impersonal studied analysis of human obligation and duty that characterized the member of the Stoa. Certain obligations rest upon him; these he will scrupulously perform, his tranquillity unshaken. Is some one in distress? He will relieve him, for that is his duty; the man is a fellow human being even as he. He will dry the tears of others, but will not mingle his own with them.[20]

> Whenever able, he will interpose between Fortune and her victim, for what better employment can he find for his wealth and strength than in setting up again what chance has overthrown?[21]

While the Stoic fulfilled his relations to his fellows consistently and worthily, it was ever because it was his duty, not because it was prompted by spontaneous love. For Paul the opposite was true. Not duty, but the overpowering recognition that the man in jeopardy was a brother for whom Christ had died was his incentive. It was this that led Paul for twenty years to endure a life of suffering and privation; not because of an ascetic fondness for suffering, but because, himself in communion with Christ, whose essential nature was love, there streamed over Paul the power of love as the power of all ethical action. From the nature of his experience he could do no other. His life had been transformed. It was not that, now being in Christ, he sought to do his will, but since he was in Christ he partook of his nature to such a degree that any other course of conduct would have been impossible.

[20] Sen., *de Clem.* 2, 6, 2.
[21] *Ibid.* 2, 6, 3.

Mention has been made frequently of the change wrought by fellowship with the Lord and to the fact that by it a character conformed to Christ's own resulted. For Paul this was no figure of speech. It was not that a man in Christ *ought* to love his brethren, but actually he could not do otherwise. If the Holy Spirit really dwelt in him, it was no longer the man himself, but Christ that worked and lived in him.

While parallels may be seen in the Stoic recognition of the essential similarity of mankind, the need of cooperation, and particularly in the use of the familiar figure of the body and its members, there was a fundamental difference. Paul's attention and interest was focused on the Christian group as such. They were to strive to live peaceably with all men, but their first obligation, as has been pointed out,[22] lay toward members of their own number. Above all, Paul sought to make the early church a brotherhood with a distinct self-consciousness, possessed by the Oriental mystery cults, but quite lacking in Stoicism, where "all men everywhere," theoretically, at least, were regarded as brothers.

It was Israel's self-consciousness and confidence that she was different from all other peoples that prevented dissolution during her stormy history. Paul was heir to this national *koinonia*. Jesus apparently had had no thought of breaking away from Judaism; his purpose had been to purify from within, to call men to repentance and to the recognition that the kingdom was at

[22] Pp. 202 f.

hand. Like the Puritans in the English church, his early disciples had no thought of leaving the Jewish church. They were a new reformed synagogue. With Paul it was different. He broke away and, like the Separatists, sought to establish new groups outside, yet without recognizing them as new. They and they alone were the true Israel.[23] The Jews had been false to God. All the fanatical national love of the Hebrew of the Hebrews and the desire to keep the chosen people unmixed from error were now devoted to preserve and to strengthen the true Israel of God.

The old line of demarcation between Jew and Gentile, circumcised and uncircumcised, was done away with. The middle wall of partititon has been broken down. The old hostility between Jew and Gentile had now given way to peace.[24] It is not, however, accurate to assume that for Paul no line of demarcation any longer existed. There was the distinctive badge, though not made by man's hands in the flesh. This was faith in Christ. As sharp a line was drawn between the believer and unbeliever as had ever been drawn by the most orthodox Jew. Paul was a missionary and his churches were missionary, yet there was this constant recognition that they were consecrated, set apart to God, *in Christ.* Like the groups of the other mystery cults, they were possessed of a common secret, linked to a common

---

[23] This tendency, perfectly familiar to the historian, finds full expression in the epistle of Barnabas.

[24] Eph. 2:11 ff. The peace referred to in v. 14 is of course to be understood not as between men and God, but between Jew and Gentile.

Lord—"one Lord, one faith, one baptism.[25] Unlike them, there was a constant emphasis on the duties and obligations they bore one another. Learning the secret was not all; living worthily of the gospel meant living in the most complete harmony and mutual helpfulness. "Let all things be done unto edifying," he wrote the Corinthians.[26] "Build each other up," he had counseled the little group at Thessalonica.[27] To the Romans, "So then let us follow after things that make for peace, and things whereby we may edify one another."[28] The individual or the church or the whole Christian body, as the case may be, "is a building of God of which Christ is the foundation (I Cor. 3:11; Eph. 2:20, 21), on which the work of building is to proceed until the Parousia."[29] Paul had received his authority for the edification of the group, to strengthen and build them up—not to tear them down.[30] Similarly, each member was to recognize his common duty to the group, a fellowship of brethren. All love and compassion for the neighbor, indeed, everything pertaining to edification,[31] depended on the fact that the neighbor was actually the brother for whose sake Christ had died.[32]

This recognition of the essential brotherhood of believers attracted early comment.

---

[25] Eph. 4:5.

[26] I Cor. 14:26.

[27] I Thes. 5:11.

[28] Rom. 14:19. The reading *διώκωμεν* is certainly to be preferred in spite of the weighty manuscript support of its rival.

[29] Meyer on Rom. 14:19 [E. T., p. 519].

[30] II Cor. 10:8; 13:10.

[31] Rom. 14:19; I Cor. 8:1 ff.; 14:12, 26; Eph. 4:16; etc.

[32] Rom. 14:15; I Cor. 8:11.

> It was impressed on them [*i.e.*, the Christians] by their original law-giver that they are all brothers[33] from the moment that they are converted and deny the gods of Greece and worship the crucified sage and live after his laws,

wrote Lucian in his satire, *de Morte Peregrini*,[34] in the second century (169 A.D.). The fact that gave this statement point was due in no small measure to the activity and work of the early apostle.

Mention has been constantly made of an obvious difficulty that faces the student of Paul: the fragmentary nature of his letters and the fact that they were called forth by special emergencies. Again, he was not a moral philosopher like Epictetus, but a wandering missionary, no small part of whose task was the attempt to keep in some semblance of Christian order groups of converts in the various towns and cities of the empire. As we have seen, they would come in constant contact with the outside world. Paul admonished them to conduct themselves with discretion toward those outside, doing nothing to bring the name of Christ into disrepute. But the Christians needed a great deal of instruction regarding the way they should conduct themselves within the Christian fellowship, in their relations to one another and to the group itself.

For Paul love was the all-embracing virtue; from it the others sprang. To the Thessalonians he wrote:

---

[33] For the Christian use of this term see Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums*, pp. 289 ff.; for the pagan use, Deissmann, *Bible Studies* (1901), pp. 87 f.

[34] 13, p. 337.

> See that none render unto any one evil for evil; but always follow after that which is good, one toward another, and toward all.[35]

"That which is good" can hardly be other than a synonym for love.[36] All other commandments were so thoroughly subordinated to the commandment of love that he could say that whoever had fulfilled this commandment stood in the moral scale as if he had fulfilled the whole law.[37] Just as faith had taken the place of law between men and God, so love took the place of definite legal enactments between man and man. Of the fruits of the spirit love was the first and most inclusive;[38] of the virtues with which the Christian must clothe himself it was chief: "above all these things put on love which is the bond of perfectness."[39] This word (ἀγάπη), which is for Paul the queen of the virtues, never occurs outside the biblical writers.[40]

Although the technical term for the mutual love which Christians as such should have one for the other (φιλαδελφία) occurs but twice in his letters,[41] the virtue is constantly before Paul's eyes.[42] Indeed, it would appear that when he wrote ἀγάπη he had in mind, at least as its chief manifestation, the practice of this cardinal virtue within the ranks of the Christian fellowship. Affection for the brotherhood might not and should not exclude love to all; it could not, nevertheless, avoid a line of cleavage. Recently A. Deissmann[43] has made an interesting suggestion regarding the phrase, "the love of Christ." He maintains that at least in some contexts, notably Eph. 3:19, the ordinary explanation of τοῦ Χριστοῦ as a subjective genitive—that is, Christ's love toward us—is unsatisfactory, and that it is to be explained in line with the fundamental conception of the mystical union of Christ and believers. Accordingly, he coins the term "mystical" genitive.[44] It means love in Christ, "love to the neighbor, the effective power of which springs from communion with Christ." The risen Christ, the spirit of Christ in Paul, gives him power. "Because He Himself is love there streams over Paul from communion with Him, this power of love as the power of ethical action." This is the "love of Christ."

---

[35] I Thes. 5:15.

[36] This interpretation is rendered probable by a comparison of I Thes. 5:15 (τὸ ἀγαθὸν—contrasted with κακόν—διώκετε), Rom. 13:10 (ἡ ἀγάπη τῷ πλησίον κακὸν οὐκ ἐργάζεται), I Cor. 14:1 (διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην).

[37] Rom. 13:8–10; Gal. 5:14.

[38] Gal. 5:22.

[39] Col. 3:14.

[40] ἀγαπάζω, ἀγαπάω, and derivatives are frequent in classical writers. It is not without interest to see their almost entire neglect in Epictetus. ἀγαπᾶν occurs once in his discourses (4, 4, 45) in the sense of "be content with," and in two or three utterances ascribed to him. Similarly, ἀγαπητός (beloved), a favorite in Paul, occurs but once (4, 12, 19) and here in the sense of "satisfactory."

[41] Rom. 12:10; I Thes. 4:9. For a similar term for this virtue (φιλοστοργία) see p. 128.

In Gal. 5:13 Paul wrote: "For ye, brethren, were called for freedom; only use not your freedom for an occasion to the flesh, but through love be servants one to another." Here is the kernel of his social ethics with its intimate connection of love and service, forbearance and freedom. The doctrine of freedom required careful stating and constant qualification since it was freedom from all law—moral as well as ceremonial. That this resulted, at least incipiently, in antinomianism—notably with the *pneumatikoi* at Corinth—we have already observed. Not only was there the danger that excesses of immorality would follow the misinterpretation of this teaching and that liberty would be interpreted as license, but there was the danger that the members of the various churches would lose sight of their debt to their fellow Christians through the notion of their own emancipation. To guard against this disaster Paul urged the sovereign χάρισμα, *love.* Christian liberty was always to be so modified that the interests of others should be scrupulously guarded. Paul, though free, was ready to sacrifice his freedom to the claims of brotherhood; so must the other Christians. Christianity consummated the ethics of self-realization by the ethics of self-sacrifice. To the Corinthians he might write: "All things are yours,"[45] but the conclusion was essential, "and ye are Christ's." Their freedom must never be at the expense of a brother; it found itself only in service.

---

[42] Cf. among other passages: Rom. 12:9, 10; 13:8, 9; 14:15; I Cor. 8:2; 13:1 ff.; 14:1, 17; II Cor. 6:6; Gal. 5:13, 14, 22; Phil. 2:1, 2; Col. 1:4, 8; 2:2; 3:14; I Thes. 1:3; 3:12; 4:9 f.; 5:8, 13; II Thes. 1:3.

[43] *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, p. 250.

[44] For his similar explanation of the phrase, "the sufferings of Christ," see (present volume), p. 226.

FORBEARANC

This suggests the question of forbearance, a most important principle for Paul. As was so often the case, Paul developed a cardinal teaching through practical advice on some matter that was troubling one of the groups. Taking the specific case, he would develop the general principle involved. The question had arisen in Corinth as to the advisability of Christians eating meat which had been consecrated to idols. In their letter to Paul apparently they had asked his advice on this vexed point. In I Cor. 8 he gives his answer; then after an apparent change of subject he returns in 10:14 to the question. But the change of subject is only apparent. 9:1-10:13 is not a digression, but a careful exposition of his views on forbearance. Only as this quality is exhibited by the Corinthians can the question of εἰδωλόθυτα be settled.

---

[45] I Cor. 3:21 ff.

The real trouble in Corinth was apparently not the division of the church into three or four parties, as I Cor. 1:12 ff. might suggest, but the overbearing attitude of a group arrogating to themselves alone the title "spiritual" (πνευματικοί). They alone had the true *gnosis*; by their ability in glossalalia their spiritual character was revealed. They were above all law and could not sin. It would seem as if they had taken Paul's teaching of freedom and had distorted it to mean license, while the idea of consecration to the Lord had given rise to perfectionism, with, as is usually the case, a complete collapse of morals. Standards were no longer necessary; they had been initiated into the Christian mystery. As a result they had obtained immunity and could do as they chose. It was to meet this boast that the parallel case of the destruction of the Israelites in the wilderness was cited.[46] They had been baptized in the cloud and in the sea, had eaten the manna and had drunk from the rock while in the wilderness, yet, because of their sin they had perished. Accordingly, the Christians in Corinth were not to presume on their initiation. This tragedy in the wilderness had been for their warning.

---

[46] I Cor. 10:1–11.

In a previous chapter[47] I have considered the question of participation in the heathen feasts or temple dinner parties. These were absolutely banned. However, there was this other question. Most of the meat found in the butcher shops of a heathen city had been consecrated to some god. Often all that had been done had been the burning of a few hairs; nevertheless, the consecration had taken place. The meat had not been spoiled and was offered for sale. The question arose in Christian circles as to what the Christian's attitude should be. Might he eat the meat? Paul's answer was that the consecration to the idol was of no real significance, since the idol was nothing. The danger did not lie in the meat, nor in the idol, but in causing some Christian, who had not been able to see the insignificance of the consecration, to go contrary to what he felt to be right. Ironically quoting the Corinthians' boast that all had knowledge,[48] he developed his argument. Resting on the consciousness of one's own superior enlightenment rather than on the desire to help others tended to arrogance. In this fancied superiority the *pneumatikoi* may well have referred contemptuously to those who felt it wrong to eat the meat as "weak," ἀσθενεῖς.[49] The danger was that a Christian who felt it wrong to partake of such food would see other Christians doing it, and would follow suit regardless of his scruples, and so would commit a sin by failing to do what he believed to be right. The result would be that instead of striving to help and strengthen the weaker Christian the man would actually destroy a brother for whom Christ had died.[50]

---

[47] Pp. 140 ff.

[48] I Cor. 8:1.

Then follows a most skillful argument.[51] He expounded the principle of forbearance underlying his judgment regarding eating the meat by defending himself at the same time from the charges brought against him. He had certain rights and privileges, as eating and drinking, marrying, receiving support from them in return for his services. Though he might have claimed these, he had not done so. Similarly, they should cease harping continuously on their freedom and ability, but should rather recognize the higher constraints. As he had gladly given up privileges for the sake of others, so should they. The emphatic position and repetition of ἐλευθερός (free), (vv. 1, 19) suggest that the *pneumatikoi* had urged that they were free, not bound by foolish superstition. Paul's answer was pointed. Free? yes, so am I; but that is not all. Though free from all, I enslaved myself, nevertheless, to (for?) all (v. 19a) through the desire to win them for Christ.

---

[49] Either because he was too weak to resist the temptation to follow others, or, as is much more probable, "weak" through not being illumined by *gnosis*. The contrast expressed in 8:10 suggests the latter view, while 9:22 can hardly be understood otherwise. Again, the irony in Paul's reference to the ἰσχυρότεροι (10:22) and to ἡ ἐλευθερία (10:29) strongly favors the view that the epithet had been used contemptuously by the *gnosis*-filled *pneumatikoi.*

[50] I Cor. 8:12.

[51] I Cor. 9:1–27.

Regarding the use of meat, then, they might buy what meat they desired in the butcher's shop without asking any questions.[52] Even had it been consecrated, its nature was unchanged. So long as they did not know that it was consecrated it was all right for use, since there would be no danger of prejudicing others. Similarly, if a Christian was invited by an unbeliever to dinner, he should eat what was set before him without question (v. 27). If, however, the host told him that it was ἱερόθυτον (consecrated) he should refrain "for conscience' sake"—not his own but that of the other. The identity of the "other" is not quite certain, though it would seem to be the host. If so, it would apparently mean that the Christian's act might prejudice the unbeliever from being converted. Again, it may refer to some chance weak brother also present. The principle, however, is clear. All things, while lawful for the Christian, did not tend to edification. Only those that were of a nature to strengthen and help were to be indulged.[53]

In the baffling section, Rom. 14:1–15:13, similar phrases and arguments are used, but the situation is quite different. Here there is no mention of the consecrated meat; rather the reference is apparently to a dispute over the kind of food appropriate to the Christian. Paul limited his advice to the moral side. As in the epistle to Corinth, so here he urged forbearance. One must not let his acts keep a Christian brother away from Christ; meat is not worth that. But in addition to the danger of those who had faith to eat the meat, despising the weak, there was also the danger of the "scrupulous" group exercising censorious judgment over the liberal group.[54] Not the nature of the food,[55] but disregard of the rights and privileges of others constituted the sin. The duty of the Christian was to put first things first, to strive after the things that would be constructive in the church, not to jeopardize a great work for a bellyful of meats. The strong must use their strength to bear the burdens of the weak. The edification of the neighbor, not the gratification of appetite or prejudice, must govern the Christian's choice.[56]

---

[52] I Cor. 10:25 f.

[53] It is to be observed that no mention is made of the "decrees" of Acts 15:28 f., although, had Paul concurred to this requirement for Gentile Christians, the failure to refer to it is at least most surprising. Attempts have been made, but without success, to side-step this obvious difficulty. For example, Lake (*The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 202) suggests that it is "quite possible that they had been appealed to by the stricter party, and that St. Paul's answer is intended as giving his view of the justification and meaning of the decree so far as things offered to idols are concerned." Yet even this ingenious suggestion he candidly admits cannot be proved. Personally, the entire disregard of them here tends to strengthen my doubts as to the historical nature of the decrees, if not of the council itself as well.

Again in the epistle to Galatia the same need was stressed: "Let us not become vainglorious, provoking one another, envying one another."[57] Here apparently the consciousness of freedom had led some in pride to challenge their more timid or scrupulous brethren. This led the latter group to envy the others who did what they themselves did not dare to do. To correct this error he admonished them to walk by the Spirit, whose fruits were love, joy, and peace.

---

[54] Rom. 14:10.

[55] Attempts to identify the groups in Rome and to establish their tenets have been the delight of many a critic regardless of the fact that the data are incomplete. After reading the lengthy reconstructions one feels the justice of the cautious word (Lake, *op. cit.*, p. 382), "The truth appears to be that the question is insoluble."

[56] Rom. 14:20. [57] Gal. 5:26.

Forbearance should not be considered one in a series of virtues. Rather it was the underlying principle making possible a true community life. As we have seen, love for Paul was the all-embracing quality of the Christian life, the complete fulfillment of all law. So chastity and bravery, as well as kindness and compassion, were included and made possible by it. Forbearance was thus rather more than a fruit of love; it was actually love in its social aspect.

Burton has argued that ἐριθία (ἐριθεία) in the New Testament regularly has the meaning "self-seeking" or "selfishness" rather than that usually given it of "party spirit."

> The term denotes what is for the apostle the very root-vice of all sin; it is certainly more probable that he found this in selfishness, the antithesis of the all-inclusive virtue, love, than in so specialized a form of selfishness as party spirit.[58]

It must be said that the position of this vice in the midst of the catalogue of Gal. 5:20 hardly favors Burton's view, yet it should be observed that in Phil. 1:16 f. οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἐριθίας is set in contrast to οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἀγάπης. Whether or not this word itself was the generic term for Paul for the all-inclusive vice, the fact is patent that in his eyes selfishness was the source of all the trouble in the various churches, disrupting their peace and endangering their

---

[58] *ICC Gal.*, pp. 308 f.

koinonia by allowing self-interest to obscure one's duty to one's fellows.

So at Corinth the fundamental trouble with the self-styled *pneumatikoi* was their selfishness. Nor was it due merely to their unwillingness to abstain from personal privileges through disregard for the weaker brethren, but rather to their contempt for all who were not enabled, as were they, to speak with the tongues of men and of angels.[59] So hostile to true *koinonia* was this anti-social discrimination that Paul sought through an illustration drawn from the human body to prove that there were various spiritual gifts and that none should be despised. Everything was to be done with an eye to the good of the whole. So while glossolalia was not condemned—Paul himself had the gift and recognized its value for the individual[60]—yet prophecy, whereby all might be helped, was far more valuable. Accordingly, unless an interpreter was present to make this exercise helpful to the group, glossolalia was not to be indulged.

Although this familiar passage is not properly concerned with morals, but with the conduct of worship, a vital ethical principle underlay Paul's teaching. The individual was not to think of self alone; his obligation was to the group. No arrogance arising from a misplaced confidence in his superior *gnosis* was to lead him to disregard his social duty.

It is from the situation suggested by the words, "Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth,"[61] that the lyric on love and its superiority to knowledge is to be understood.[62] So it is apparently to be regarded not as an interpolation by some later Christian writer as a protest against enthusiasm, as Lehmann and Fridrichsen[63] argue, but as a skillful introduction into the argument by Paul himself of a literary passage, either previously composed for just such an occasion, or, if not actually written, at least in definite form in his mind. This he used effectively against the claims of the antisocial *pneumatikoi*. This view would account for any appearance of a break in thought between chapters 12 and 14, as well as for the literary character of the section, which can hardly be considered impromptu. His opponents apparently held some view similar to Plato's, that present knowledge would grow to completeness and was the true badge of human dignity. Against this Paul pointed out that at the best it was but temporary and perishable, giving place to a new kind when God should be seen face to face—a view familiar to us through mediæval mysticism, but characteristic of Greek rather than of Jewish thought. Perhaps the most significant fact in this section—at any rate, it is the most interesting—is that the gifts which Paul is subordinating, although they are good in themselves, as, for example, the ability to "speak with the tongues of men and of angels," are those which the *pneumatikoi* are claiming arrogantly as their unique possession, while the qualities which make for love, or evidence its presence, are precisely those which his opponents lack so conspicuously.

---

[59] For a discussion of glossolalia see Lietzmann, *Handb. I Kor.*, pp. 69–71.

[60] I Cor. 14:18.

[61] I Cor. 8:1.

---

[62] I Cor. 13.

[63] *Theol. Stud. und Krit.*, 1922, pp. 55–95.

The triad, faith, hope, love, with which the hymn closes intrigues Reitzenstein.[64] Originally it contained a fourth, "knowledge," and was a formula that Paul's opponents had used against him. This Paul had adopted, but, due to his conviction of the superiority of love to knowledge, had omitted the latter. Reitzenstein's work has made necessary the admission that hellenistic triads and tetrads may well have existed in Corinth as elsewhere. Again, this suggestion that Paul has here turned an opponent's word of protest back upon the hapless critic is not far-fetched. Paul apparently did this time and again. On the other hand, the juxtaposition of these three words (faith, hope, love) in other letters[65] earlier and later than that to Corinth, makes it appear more probable to me that Paul was not working over a formula used against him, but was citing three types of virtue which he held in high esteem. This would seem to be the nearest approach Paul made to a Christian register of virtues akin to the Platonic and Stoic tetrad, temperance, bravery, justice, and wisdom.

In so far as forbearance was practiced the groups would find themselves blessed with peace and harmony. Unity was to be achieved under the guidance of the

---

[64] "Die Formel 'Glaube, Liebe, Hoffnung' bei Paulus," *Nachrichten d. Gesellschaft d. Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (*Phil.-hist. Kl.*) 1916, pp. 367–416; "Nachwort," *op. cit.*, 1917, pp. 130–151; "Die Enstellung der Formel 'Glaube, Liebe, Hoffnung' bei Paulus," *Hist. Zeitschrift*, 1916, pp. 189–208. For a brief comment see Windisch, "Literature on New Testament," *Harv. Theol. Rev.*, April, 1922, pp. 190 f.

[65] Gal. 5:5 f.; Col. 1:4 f.; I Thes. 1:3; 5:8.

Spirit; peace was the bond that held the members in this unity.[66] God was the God of peace,[67] and had called them to peace.[68] Peace among the brethren was one of the chief fruits of the spirit. This peace, which results from true fellowship with Christ, was to be the guiding principle in their hearts, he wrote the Colossians.[69]

The experiences through which Paul had passed have left their impress on his thought. The constant dissension and wrangling that marred the fellowship in almost all his churches may be seen reflected in his letters as he urged the need of peace. The oft-repeated admonition, "to be of the same mind,"[70] was directed against the constant tendency toward bickering. Indeed the words,

> Now I beseech you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfected together in the same judgment,[71]

are almost certainly to be interpreted not as the deprecation of some particular views or heresy, but of the contentiousness that was jeopardizing the harmony of the Corinthian *koinonia*. Similarly, the "parties" (αἰρέσεις) of Gal. 5:20 are probably to be understood as in

---

[66] Eph. 4:3.

[67] Rom. 15:33; 16:20; I Cor. 14:33; II Cor. 13:11; Phil. 4:9; I Thes. 5:23; II Thes. 3:16. A characteristically Pauline expression found elsewhere in the N. T. only in Hebr. 13:20.

[68] Col. 3:15b; I Cor. 7:15; cf. Rom. 14:19; Phil. 4:7 and often.

[69] Col. 3:15a.

[70] Rom. 12:16; 15:5; II Cor. 13:11; Phil. 2:2; 4:2; cf. I Cor. 1:10.

[71] I Cor. 1:10. The figure underlying κατηρτισμένοι is lost in the translation, "perfected." It is a word used for setting a bone; so here: "nicely fitted together in a neat joint."

I Cor. 11:19[72] as differences of opinion, akin to the "divisions" (διχοστασίαι)[73] of the preceding verse. The meaning "heresy" never occurs in the New Testament nor in the Apostolic Fathers. To the Romans he wrote, "If it be possible, as much as in you lieth, be at peace with all men."[74] To the Corinthians, "Be of the same mind; live in peace."[75] To the group at Thessalonica, which was in a ferment due to the clash between the "loafers" and their not too tactful brethren, as a mild reproof to both groups, "Be at peace among yourselves."[76] It is little wonder that amid churches always wrangling and bickering Paul stressed constantly the need of peace and harmony. "Now the Lord of peace himself give you peace at all times in all ways"[77] must have been the heartfelt prayer of the apostle more than once.

HUMILITY

One of the greatest hindrances to the harmony and peace which should characterize the Christian fellowship was the very common vice of over-estimation of self. For Paul few virtues ranked before humility (ταπεινοφροσύνη).[78] "Doing nothing through faction or through vainglory, but in lowliness of mind, each counting other better than himself"[79] must be the basis for all true harmony. The Lord himself had set the example by humbling himself and "becoming obedient even unto death."[80]

---

[72] Probably ironical in the sense, "It is inevitable, of course, if the 'approved' are to be 'manifest'!" [73] Cf. also Rom. 16:17. [74] Rom. 12:18.

[75] II Cor. 13:11.

[76] I Thes. 5:13; cf. ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (BAD^{C}EKL al plu not ἐν αὐτοῖς ℵDFGP vg) instead of μετ' αὐτῶν. [77] II Thes. 3:16.

[78] The fact that the specific word ταπεινοφροσύνη occurs in Paul's writing only three times as the name of a Christian virtue (Eph. 4:2; Phil. 2:3; Col. 3:12—for its meaning in Col. 2:18, 23 see p. 260) is not to be adduced as evidence that the quality it represented was of minor significance to him. On the contrary, it was of prime importance in shaping his thought and coloring his teaching.

The associations of this virtue were not in the Hellenic world, but in Judaism. In the Septuagint the noun *ταπεινοφροσύνη*[81] does not occur, but the ideal was well known. The arrogant Pharisee[82] who displays such an unlovely spirit has done much to obscure the fact that humility was one of the cardinal virtues for the Jew—not always lived up to, but always the ideal.

> Every one who humbles himself, God exalts; and every one who exalts himself, God humbles; one who runs around for greatness, greatness flees from, and one who flees from greatness, him greatness runs after[83]

finds ample confirmation in the Old Testament. In a discussion of the comparative merits of the various blessings R. Phineas ben Jair had ascribed to saintliness preëminence. With this R. Joshua ben Levi disagreed:

> Humility is the greatest of them all, for it is said, "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me, to bring good tidings to the humble" (Isa. 61:1). It is not said "to the saints," but "to the humble," whence you learn that humility is the greatest of them all.[84]

The remoteness of God for the Jew at the beginning of our era has been greatly overstressed.[85] Names and titles have been cited to prove that he was conceived of as afar off; that as the king of the universe he was likened to an Eastern despot completely inaccessible; and that accordingly he was to be feared, not loved and worshiped. It is always well to remember that precisely the terms that have been so stressed by Christian apologists to prove the remoteness of God to the Jew occur in the early Christian benediction, "Now unto the King, eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honor and glory for ever and ever."[86] We would be loath to feel that the Christian author conceived God as a remote being. Nor did the Jew. An examination of the titles with which God was addressed, and of the nature of the petitions of early Jewish prayers, would be sufficient to destroy this misunderstanding.

---

[79] Phil. 2:3; cf. Rom. 12:10. [80] Phil. 2:8 ff.

[81] *ταπεινόφρων* and *ταπεινοφρονεῖν* each occur once "in honor" in the LXX (Prov. 29:23; Psalm 130(131): 2), while *ταπεινός* and *ταπεινοῦν* occur with great frequency.

[82] Luke 18:11.

[83] 'Erubin 13b, quoted by G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, ii, p. 274.

[84] 'Abodah Zarah 20b, quoted by Moore, *op. cit.*, ii, p. 273.

> O our Father, merciful Father, ever compassionate, have mercy upon us. . . . Thou hast chosen us from all peoples and tongues, and hast brought us near unto thy great name forever in faithfulness, to thank thee and proclaim thy Unity in love; blessed art thou, O God, who hast chosen thy people Israel, in love. . . . Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned; pardon us, our King, for we have transgressed . . . blessed art thou, our God, who art gracious and dost abundantly forgive.[87]

> Wherever (in the Scripture) you find the Almighty power of God, you will find in the context his lowly deeds.[88]

---

[85] For a thorough criticism of this over-emphasis see G. F. Moore, "Christian Writers on Judaism," *Harvard Theological Review*, July, 1921, pp. 197–254.

[86] I Tim. 1:17.

[87] For this catena of passages I am indebted to S. Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, p. 22.

[88] Megillah 31a. This whole saying of R. Johannan as well as the similar remark of Eleazar ben Pedat may be found in Moore, *Judaism*, i, pp. 440 f.

This note of "humility of God," though clearly expressed in Psalm 18:35 (36) "Thy humility hath made me great" (עַנְוָתְךָ תַרְבֵּנִי),[89] is obscured by the rendering "gentleness," "condescension" (ARV margin) through a mistaken feeling of reluctance to posit such a virtue for God; cf. also Psalm 45:4(5).[90] When the word עֲנָוָה is used of man, as, for example, Prov. 15:33; 18:12; 22:4, the translators render it "humility" without hesitation.

Humility of spirit no less than contrition of heart insures God's abiding presence.[91] Even as he is of tender mercy and compassionate to those whose usual lot in life is hard, so must the pious do away with all form of oppression. They must feed the hungry, shelter the homeless poor, and clothe the naked.[92] This is true religion; indeed, the ideal of Micah[93] is the reflection of precisely the divine conduct. These were the attributes that characterized God. Israel was to imitate him. The overbearing, the insolent, and the arrogant all stand condemned.

---

[89] At least the rabbis so understood these words, although a different interpretation is possible. The text of the Roman edition of the LXX (*Sixtina*, 1587) is a palpable doublet, on which Nobilius notes the following scholion: Sch. τὸ, καὶ ἡ παιδεία σου αὐτή με διδάξει, Θεοδοτίονος ἐστίν, ἀντὶ τοῦ, καὶ ἡ παιδεία σου ἀνώρθωσέν με εἰς τέλος, εἰρημένου τοῖς Ο'. Apparently Aquila and the *Quinta* translated καὶ πραότης σου ἐπλήθυνέ με, while Symmachus has καὶ τὸ ὑπακούειν σοι (?) αὐξήσει με. There is no reason to assume that these Greek translators had a Hebrew text different from that of ours, although they may have pronounced it differently. The whole textual problem may be studied in Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum*. Cf. also the similar passage in II Sam. 22:36, and see the conflate text of the latter passage in Lagarde's edition.

[90] LXX πραΰτητος.

[91] Isa. 57:15.

[92] Cf. Isa. 58:3–10.

[93] Micah 6:8.

This was a dominant note in Judaism and one stressed by the rabbis. They felt delight in heaping human qualities and attributes upon God. He was best man at the wedding of Adam and Eve;[94] he teaches Torah to Israel and keeps school now in heaven for those who died in their infancy;[95] praying himself, he teaches Israel how to pray;[96] he visited Abraham when the latter was sick[97] and mourned with Isaac at Abraham's death.[98] What the rabbis protested against was not the addition of the humbler qualities to God, but the exaltation and deification of man. Accordingly, God is represented as saying to Moses:

> Though I made thee a God to Pharaoh thou must not become overbearing (and think thyself God); *I* am the Lord.[99]

Nor should it be objected that this reveals merely a later phase of Judaism. After the second century of the Christian era conditions were by no means such that a great advance in Judaism was probable; nor is there any evidence that such an advance took place. Continuity is the most striking impression, and that with very little change. It is often said that Rabbinical Judaism took its start in the great schools, as in that of Hillel. It is far more likely that the phenomenon was much older, going back to the days of the restoration, and that the real revival took place, due to the efforts of those men whom the Jews arbitrarily classed as those of the "Great Synagogue." They were the men who gave to later Judaism its ideals and aims.

---

[94] Gen. R. 8, 13.

[95] Exod. R. 28, 5; 'Abodah Zarah 3b.

[96] Berakot 7a; Rosh ha-Shanah 17b.

[97] Gen. R. 8, 13.

[98] *Ibid.*

[99] Tanḥuma ed. Buber 2, 13a. I am indebted for these references to Schechter, *op. cit.*, pp. 37 ff.

The note of humility which is so evident in Jesus' teaching, and which no less under Paul became a characteristic Christian virtue, the ideal attitude of brother to brother, is not to be looked upon as some exotic growth, but as a part of the inheritance from Judaism. So in Paul's words, "Nevertheless he that comforteth the lowly, even God comforted us . . ."[100] it is not necessary to see a new and revolutionary teaching, but a statement that would have been intelligible to any Jew.

The word ταπεινοφροσύνη does not occur in Greek writers before the Christian era. The adjective ταπεινός[101] in pagan writers was used in the sense of groveling, mean-spirited, low, and poor—a usage quite different from that in the Septuagint or early Christian writings. It is to be found in contexts with ἀγεννής, ἀνδραποδώδης, ἀνελεύθερος, δουλοπρεπής, κατηφής, and χαμαίζηλος. Epictetus places it at the head of a list of censurable qualities.[102] The noun ταπεινοφροσύνη in the one passage in which it occurs in Epictetus appears in a sense quite in keeping with the use of ταπεινός and its cognates:

> When you have learned to set no value on those things which are beyond the realm of choice and deem none of these your own, but that yours is the ability to judge aright, to form opinions, to strive toward a goal, to desire and to shun—where is there any longer room for flattery, where for *meanness* (ποῦ ταπεινοφροσύνης)?[103]

---

[100] II Cor. 7:6.

[101] Similarly, the cognates ταπεινότης, ταπεινόφρων, ταπεινόω, ταπείνωσις.

[102] 3, 2, 14; cf. 4, 1, 2.

[103] 3, 24, 56.

But it is very easy to make an exaggerated statement here, and to feel that arrogance and similar attitudes were approved by the pagan world simply because ταπεινός, which later took on under Christian usage a favorable meaning, had originally connoted the reverse. In fact, it is to be observed that instances occur, although with comparative rarity, where ταπεινός was used in a favorable sense in the older Greek writers. In Plato ταπεινός is once joined to κεκοσμημένος,[104] while in Demosthenes the phrase λόγοι μέτριοι καὶ ταπεινοί is said by Trench to occur.[105] Plutarch declares the purpose of divine punishment is that the soul may become "circumspect and *humble* and deeply awed before God."[106] On the other hand, even in Paul ταπεινοφροσύνη apparently is to be explained in two verses[107] as indicating a groveling and ostentatious humility. Much ingenuity has been exercised in striving to make these verses intelligible. A not impossible explanation is that Paul in his attack—he always finds it difficult to be scrupulously fair to his opponents—disparages their humility to these στοιχεία, whom they assert must also be revered. Precisely the same quality shown to Christ would have aroused his admiration. Zeal for a cause in which we do not ourselves believe always appears reprehensible.

---

[104] *Legg.* iv, 7, p. 716A.

[105] *Synonyms* xlii, p. 146. I have not been able to locate it.

[106] *de Sera Num. Vind.* 3, p. 549D (σύννους καὶ ταπεινὴ καὶ κατάφοβος πρὸς τὸν θεόν).

[107] Col. 2:18, 23. The difficulty of this disparagement of what elsewhere was regularly considered a virtue is hardly to be removed by the explanation that it was a common Pauline word which had been misused by some whom he was here rebuking. Apparently even in Paul the term had not become so settled in meaning that it could not be used in a different sense. But it must be frankly confessed that it does constitute a difficulty, and that to those who on other grounds deny the Pauline authorship it is a contributory argument, though not in itself sufficient.

Presumption (ὕβρις)[108] had always been anathema to the Greeks—a vice detested and abhorred by the gods (Theognis)—and the antithesis of δίκη. It tended to follow prosperity, which led to an undue self-confidence in which moderation or even divine warnings were neglected.[109] Obviously for a morality which judged actions by the standards of propriety and fitness this was the cardinal vice.

Again, while Epictetus disparages ταπεινοφροσύνη as indicating meanness of spirit, he encouraged what he felt to be true humility as is seen in his advice to a young man:

> Let no one hear a word from you about them (*i.e.*, about your cleverness and ability), and if anyone praise you for them, do not tolerate it, but let yourself be accounted a nobody and a know nothing.[110]

In somewhat the same tone as Gal. 6:3, I Cor. 8:2 he insisted that conceit or arrogance (οἴησις),[111] which leads one to feel that he lacks nothing, must be cast off along with diffidence which is near to cowardice. But while Paul wrote to the Romans, "Be not high-minded (μὴ ὑψηλὰ φρόνει), but fear''[112] Epictetus used ὑψηλόν in a favorable sense in his injunction, "Keep this man for me unchanged from the character with which nature endowed him—reverent, faithful, *highminded*, undismayed, unimpassioned, unperturbed.''[113] The Stoic like Paul might deplore arrogance and insolence, yet the reasons as well as the nomenclature were quite dissimilar. For example, Seneca might urge magnanimity as the sovereign remedy for repelling all that might otherwise be deemed insults coming from the arrogant and haughty, yet it was in no small measure due to his feeling of superiority to those "whose childhood still endures after their youth is passed and their hair is gray.''[114] Similarly, the half-contemptuous remark, "There is no reason why thou shouldst be angry; pardon them; they are all mad,''[115] reveals the superiority with which the Stoic was wont to look out on the rest of the world. The dignity of the human race—he was on a parity with God—the consciousness of his own steadfastness and refusal to be swayed by outward circumstances; the feeling that none might trouble his serenity of spirit; that when he chose he might depart, —all this could hardly help promoting an attitude of superiority and contempt, if not of intolerance, in spite of all the efforts of ratiocination.

---

[108] II Cor. 12:10 in the sense of insolence, impudence, pride. Though it occurs only here in Paul, the attitude which it expresses was the constant subject of his criticism: ὑβρισθέντες occurs in I Thes. 2:2 and ὑβριστάς in Rom. 1:30.

[109] Cf. Hom., *Od.* xvi, 86 et passim; Aesch., *Agam.* 764 ff. (733 ff.); Soph., *Oed. Tyr.* 872 f. (846 f.); Pind., *Olymp.* 13, 10 f.

[110] 2, 1, 36.

[111] 3, 14, 8; cf. 1, 8, 6; 2, 17, 1; 3, 23, 16.

For Paul the consciousness that the man was a brother for whose sake Christ had died effectually prevented the feeling of contempt. When this attitude was shown by the trouble-makers at Corinth it evoked his severest condemnation. Paul might say, "I can do all things,"[116] but the next words, "in him that strengtheneth me," robbed the statement of any arrogance. The memory of his early hostility to the faith to which he later devoted his life was an effectual preventive of pride. It was not through his own strength that he could stand up against temptation and that he had attained to his present position of prominence. The explanation was rather "By the grace of God I am what I am."[117] The thorn in his flesh was to keep him humble. His sufferings were to show God's power, and to make perfectly clear that strength came not from men—nor was it found in himself—but came from God. In this respect his thought was quite the reverse of Seneca's, for whom opposition merely revealed one's innate strength: "Fire tries the gold, misfortunes brave men."[118]

---

[112] Rom. 11:20.

[113] 2, 8, 23—*αἰδήμονα, πιστόν, ὑψηλόν, ἀκατάπληκτον, ἀπαθῆ, ἀτάραχον.*

[114] *de Const. Sap.* 13, 1. [115] *de Benef.* 5, 17, 3; cf. also p. 30.

The pride of the Jew has often been commented on, and justly. No less true is it that Christianity was even in its earliest days a proud religion. Its refusal to stand one among many is sufficient to evidence this. Yet for both Christianity and its parent the pride, at least in theory, was not pride in self, but pride in the Lord. Boasting in itself was bad. The Gentiles, who as a wild olive had been grafted into the root of Israel and had thus become part of the true Israel, were not to boast as if they had borne the root, for on the contrary the root had borne them.[119] Against conceited self-sufficiency or the feeling of moral perfection which would effectually exclude respect for the brother he uttered his warning.[120] Against those who strove to "recommend themselves" he refused letters of recommendation, and scorned to contend with those who sought "to compare themselves with themselves."[121] For the Christian the old Jewish adage was sound: "He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord."[122]

---

[116] Phil. 4:13.
[117] I Cor. 15:10.
[118] *de Prov.* 5, 8.

Nor was Paul's boasting a display of arrogance in his own power. None were worthy of the task of preaching the gospel; yet he had the one qualification that he had been sincere in his work and had refused to commercialize his calling as so many were doing.[123] The consciousness that his churches knew that his motives were pure was his one satisfaction.[124] He had pride in his churches because of their strength and fidelity. It was pride which sprang from the realization that he had a part—weak and faulty though it was—in producing a lasting work. To God alone belonged the glory, for he had given the increase.[125] The love which bound Paul to his churches and which often caused his words to be broken with emotions as to the Thessalonians[126] would be a sufficient explanation of his constant antagonism to those who were tending to destroy the harmony and peace of the churches, by their failure to recognize their responsibilities through an arrogant self-conceit as unwarranted as it was selfish.

---

[119] Rom. 11:18.

[120] Cf. Rom. 12:16; I Cor. 1:18–31 and often.

[121] II Cor. 10:12.

[122] I Cor. 1:31; II Cor. 10:17; (cf. also Gal. 6:14). This twice-repeated quotation is apparently dependent upon Jer. 9:23 f. (cf. also I Sam 2:10a LXX), although the words ἐν κυρίῳ do not here occur. I Clem. 13:1 quotes in full the Jeremiah passage, but with ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω. Various efforts have been made to account for the Pauline alteration. See J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, in loc. There seems little need for assuming either that Paul's text of the LXX included these words or that he is quoting from some apocryphon (Weiss) in which they stood. It would appear that this is but one of Paul's rough-and-ready quotations from memory, perhaps originally influenced by Deut. 10:21, and then constantly repeated. Even in this day of concordances people have their own favorite misquotations. The most important point to be observed is that for Paul κύριος is apparently to be understood as referring to Jesus. Whether I Clem. is influenced by Paul in this quotation cannot be definitely determined.

[123] II Cor. 2:17. [124] II Cor. 1:12 ff.

GENTLENESS

Another virtue of similar character enjoined by Paul was πραΰτης.[127] Unlike ταπεινοφροσύνη, πραΰτης came into Christian usage without blemish, since it was among the noblest terms of pagan ethics. In II Cor. 10:1 it was combined with ἐπιείκεια as a quality of Christ with the inference that these virtues should be emulated by Christians. The meaning "mildness," "freedom from rudeness" for πραΰτης, is rather better than the proverbial "meekness." Aristotle used it of the mean between undue resentment and slavish submission to wrong.[128] Gentleness, considerateness, the opposite of standing on one's own rights, was its regular meaning for Paul, and was used by him to express the proper attitude of the Christian to his fellows. Their mutual admonition was to be "in a spirit of gentleness."[129] With lowliness

[125] I Cor. 3:6 ff.

[126] I Thes. 2:19, 20.

[127] Identical in meaning with the older πρᾳότης.

[128] *Eth. Nic.* iv, 11 (5, 1) p. 1125b—πρᾳότης δ' ἐστὶ μὲν μεσότης περὶ ὀργάς.

[129] Gal. 6:1.

(ταπεινοφροσύνη) and long-suffering (μακροθυμία) it must characterize those who strove to walk worthily of the gospel.[130] The Corinthians were admonished to act in such a manner that Paul might come "in love and a spirit of gentleness" rather than "with a rod."[131] This word for Paul as well as for all the New Testament writers except Matthew and James seems to have been used in accord with its regular Greek meaning and not to have been influenced by the fact that πραΰς was regularly, although not invariably, used in the Septuagint to translate עָנָו—*i.e.*, one who was humble or lowly.

With πραΰτης was associated ἐπιείκεια,[132] a common word in Aristotle[133] made familiar to English readers by Matthew Arnold's famous "sweet reasonableness." The noun occurs but once in Paul [134] though τὸ ἐπιεικές—a phrase regularly used by Greek authors from Thucydides down as the equivalent of ἡ ἐπιείκεια (ὑμῶν)[135]—is found in Phil. 4:5 in the sense of forbearance, or lack of self-seeking or covetousness. This attitude of fairness, of disinclination to exact the uttermost farthing, was to be so characteristic of Christians that they might be known by it to all men.

---

[130] Eph. 4:2; cf. Col. 3:12.

[131] I Cor. 4:21.

[132] Or ἐπιεικία [W—H].

[133] Cf. his definition τί μὲν οὖν ἐστιν τὸ ἐπιεικές, καὶ ὅτι δίκαιον, καὶ τίνος βέλτιον δικαίου δῆλον· φανερὸν δ'ἐκ τούτου καὶ ὁ ἐπιεικὴς τίς ἐστίν. ὁ γὰρ τῶν τοιούτων προαιρετικὸς καὶ πρακτικός, καὶ ὁ μὴ ἀκριβοδίκαιος ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἀλλ' ἐλαττωτικός, καίπερ ἔχων τὸν νόμον βοηθόν, ἐπιεικής ἐστιν, καὶ ἡ ἕξις αὕτη ἐπιείκεια, δικαιοσύνη τις οὖσα καὶ οὐχ ἑτέρα τις ἕξις. ("What the 'equitable' is therefore is clear. It is just, but better than one form of just. Moreover, it is evident from this who 'the equitable man' is, too. The man who is wont to choose diliberately principles of this type and to put them into practice, who is not apt to be a martinet toward what is remiss, but is inclined to refrain from insisting on his full rights, even though he has the law on his side—he is 'equitable.' And this attitude of mind is 'equity,' a form of justice and not a different attitude from justice") *Eth. Nic.* v, 14 (10, 8), p. 1137b (end).

[134] II Cor. 10:1.

[135] Cf. Epict. 3, 20, 1.

KINDNES

Another fruit of the spirit was χρηστότης or kindness.[136] As humility (ταπεινοφροσύνη) was to characterize the Christian's estimate of self, so kindness (χρηστότης) was to characterize him in his dealings with others.[137] In addition to the meaning "kindness" χρηστότης was used, though less often in the classic writers, in the more general sense of "goodness."[138] For Paul except in Rom. 3:12—a quotation from Psalm 14:3—it has the specific meaning "kindness." The note of sympathy, almost entirely lacking from the stern justice of the Stoic and which was so characteristic of Paul's teaching, clearly colors his use of the term.[139]

LONG-SUFFERIN

With χρηστότης is joined several times μακροθυμία in the Pauline letters.[140] As ὑπομονή signified steadfastness and the refusal to yield under pressure, μακροθυμία was used by Paul in the sense of slowness to anger, long-temperedness toward those whose actions were calculated to annoy. Chrysostom's remark, "A man exhibits *μακροθυμία* toward those whom he is able to requite,"[141] strikes the exact note. In addition to this meaning of self-restraint the word, though rare outside the New Testament, does occur in the more general sense of "steadfastness of soul under provocation to change." According to Plutarch, it was the quality the Roman general Lucullus urged upon his rebellious soldiers."[142]

---

[136] Rom. 2; 4; 11:22; II Cor. 6:6; Gal. 5:22; Eph. 2:7; Col. 3:12.

[137] Col. 3:12.

[138] In the LXX it translates טוב in both the specific and the general sense. Jerome (*Comm. in Ep. ad Gal.* 5:22) says of it:

"*Benignitas* etiam sive suavitas, quia apud Græcos χρηστότης utrumque sonat, virtus est lenis, blanda, tranquilla et omnium bonorum apta consortio; invitans ad familiaritatem sui, dulcis alloquio, moribus temperata. Denique et hanc Stoici ita definiunt: Benignitas est virtus sponte ad benefaciendum exposita."

[139] In Epictetus χρηστότης occurs three times: *S* 15 (26) ἐπὶ χρηστότητι καὶ εὐποιίᾳ. In this connection either kindness or integrity is possible; *S* 34 (11) in contrast with μοχθηρία, badness, wickedness (cf. Arist. *Eth. N.* v, 1, 14 ἀρεταὶ καὶ μοχθηρίαι) and so apparently goodness, integrity; *S* 43 (49) τὸ δὲ ἦθος χρηστότητι κοινωνίας λαμπρύνειν φιλοκάλου ἅμα καὶ φιλανθρώπου. Again, either meaning is possible, although perhaps kindness is slightly more probable.

[140] II Cor. 6:6; Gal. 5:22; cf. I Cor. 13:4.

But though the Christian was to be slow to anger and to exclude completely all thoughts of revenge, yet anger was not for Paul, as for the Stoic, an unqualified vice. In Ephesians[143] he wrote (quoting Psalm 4:4): "Be ye angry, and sin not; let not the sun go down upon your wrath." Although the first imperative is in a sense the protasis of a condition, the important point to be observed is that anger in itself was not sin; but while justifiable under certain circumstances, when cherished it soon led to sinful acts. Accordingly, the word was, "Let the day of your anger be that of your reconciliation." Similar sentiments may be found in both the Greek and the Hebrew writings. Plutarch wrote of the Pythagoreans:

> The Pythagoreans were inimitable for this, that though no nearer related than by mere common discipline and education, if at any time in a passion they broke out into opprobrious lan-

---

[141] *μακροθυμεῖ τις πρὸς ἐκείνους οὓς δύνατον καὶ ἀμύνασθαι*—*Hom.* ii, 2 on Col., *ed. cit.* xi, 385 (335A). See also p. 222.

[142] Plut., *Vit. Lucull.* 32, p. 514.

[143] Eph. 4:26.

> guage, before the sun set they gave one another their hands, and with them a discharge from all injuries, and so with a mutual salutation concluded friends.[144]

It is quite possible that the words "let not the sun go down upon your wrath" are to be seen as a reflection of the old Hebrew adage, "In his day thou shalt give him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it."[145] I cannot forbear to quote the quaint remark of Thomas Fuller (*ob.* 1661):

> Let us take the apostle's meaning rather than his words—with all possible speed to depose our passion; not understanding him so literally that we may take leave to be angry till sunset: then might our wrath lengthen with the days; and men in Greenland, where days last above a quarter of a year, have plentiful scope for revenge.[146]

If we can judge from the narrative in Acts, Paul had known times of anger. Throughout the epistle to the Galatians the white heat under which he was writing is apparent. But neither here nor in the equally severe portion of II Cor. was it anger at a personal grievance or desire for revenge, but indignation at the action of men whom he believed were hostile to the Lord. With regard to personal grievances his teaching was explicit: "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and railing, be put away from you, with all malice." The feeling of resentment, the excitement of rising passion, anger in its more settled form,[147] reviling and insult with malice—all of which were in such complete contrast to what the Christian as an imitator of God should feel—were never to be indulged.

---

[144] *de Amore Fratr.* 17, p. 488 C.

[145] Deut. 24:15; cf. also Deut. 21:23; Josh. 8:29; 10:27.

[146] *Holy and Profane State* (London 1841), p. 161, quoted by Eadie, *A Commentary on the Greek Text of Ephesians,* in loc.

For the Stoic all anger was evil. "No plague has cost the human race more dear"[148] wrote Seneca early in his lengthy attack, *de Ira*. As Lactantius pointed out, "The Stoic did not perceive that there is a difference between right and wrong (anger); as they could find no remedy for it they wished to extirpate it."[149]

> The wise man will not be angry with sinners. Do you ask why? Because he knows that no one is wise but becomes so.[150]

> You must banish virtue from your mind before you can take wrath into the same, because vices do not combine with virtues, and no one can at the same time be both an angry man and a good man any more than he can be both sick and well.[151]

Passion and emotions were to be extirpated, since they interfered with the tranquillity toward which the Stoic aimed; of all passions "there is none over which anger does not bear absolute rule."[152]

---

[147] Eph. 4:31; cf. Col. 3:8. For the distinction, usually although not invariably maintained, between *θυμός* (the sudden burst of passion) and *ὀργή* (wrath which is slower in rising, but slower also in being dissipated) see Trench, *Synonyms*, §xxxvii, pp. 127–139. In addition to the passages therein referred to, compare also Seneca, *de Ira*, 2, 36, 5: Aiacem in mortem egit furor, in furorem ira; and Isidorus Pelusiota (ob. *ca* 440 A.D.) *Epist.* iv, 223, Migne vol. lxxviii, p. 1317b—*θυμὸς καὶ ὀργή δοκεῖ μὲν ἕν τι εἶναι τὸ αὐτὸ τάχα· ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν μηνύει τὴν ὀξεῖαν τοῦ πάθους κίνησιν, τὴν καὶ τὰς ἐννοίας κλέπτουσαν· ἡ δὲ τὴν χρονίαν ἐν τῷ πάθει διατριβήν. διὸ καὶ ὁ μὲν παρὰ τὴν ἀναθυμίασιν εἴρηται, ὁ δὲ παρὰ τὸ ὀργᾶν καὶ ἀμύνης ἐρᾶν.*

[148] *de Ira* 1, 2, 1.

[149] *de Ira Dei* 17.

[150] Sen., *de Ira* 2, 10, 6.

[151] *de Ira* 2, 12, 2.

[152] *de Ira* 2, 36, 6.

> The man who does not become angry remains unshaken by injury; he who becomes angry has been moved by it;[153]

Or again:

> To rage with anger is a womanish trick.[154]

This explains Seneca's hostility. Indeed, anger was at the best a silly thing:

> Why are you angry with your slave, you with your master, you with your patron, you with your client? Wait but a little while. Lo here comes death who will make you all equal. . . . Rather let us pass the little remnant of our life in peace and repose.[155]

Epictetus expressed the rational objection to anger:

> It is impossible for one to be deluded and another to suffer for it. [The man who remembers this] will be angry with no one, will be enraged at no one, will revile no one, will censure no one, will hate no one, will quarrel with no one.[156]

Paul's emphasis upon long-temperedness, patience (*μακροθυμία*), was not due to any such studied reasoning as to the absurdity of anger, but rather because indulgence to anger gave access to hatred, and malice, and the kindred vices, than which nothing would be more disruptive of the unity and peace in which the saints should live. A brief consideration of some of the more characteristics of these vices, hostile to the harmony of the churches, may not be out of place.

Ζῆλος in Plato and Aristotle was not classed as a vice, but regularly appeared as a virtue in contrast to *φθόνος*, although Hesiod had used it in the sinister sense

Jealousy
RIVALRY

---

[153] *de Ira* 3, 25, 3.
[154] *de Clem.* 2, 5, 5.
[155] *de Ira* 3, 43, 1 f.
[156] 1, 28, 10.

as the equivalent of φθόνος.[157] In Paul it occurs in both senses. In Rom. 10:2; II Cor. 7:7, 11; 9:2; 11:2; Phil. 3:6 it signifies intense devotion and concern almost equivalent to our "zeal," while in Rom. 13:13; I Cor. 3:3; II Cor. 12:20; Gal. 5:20 it has the meaning "envious and contentious rivalry" (Thayer). Unlike ζῆλος, φθόνος[158] is never used in a favorable sense, but is consistently the vice of envy, the mean characteristic of the man who maliciously begrudges his neighbor his good fortune,[159] and which prompted the Greek proverb, "Envy is without the divine chorus." It may be remembered that it was this vice, Plutarch says, which caused the Athenian his annoyance at hearing Aristides always styled "The Just."[160]

ENVY

STRIFE

Ἔρις is several times used by Paul.[161] Although in the Odyssey and in later Greek it was often used much as ζῆλος in the sense of a justifiable rivalry, and although Hesiod[162] distinguishes between a good and bad ἔρις, it was for Paul the vice of contention, strife, wrangling, and was resolutely to be shunned. Like ζῆλος, it does not occur in the words of Epictetus, although φθόνος and ζηλοτυπία (jealousy) were jointly disparaged.

---

[157] *Op.* 195 f.—

ζῆλος δ' ἀνθρώποισιν οἰζυροῖσιν ἅπασι
δυσκέλαδος κακόχαρτος ὁμαρτήσει στυγερώπης.

[158] For the unusual phrase πρὸς φθόνον in Jas. 4:5 see Ropes, *ICC* in loc.

[159] φθόνον δὲ λύπην ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίοις ἀγαθοῖς (Diog. Laert. vii, 11); cf. also *Test. XII Patr., Gad* 7, 1 f.

[160] Plutarch, *Vit. Aristides* 7, p. 323.

[161] The word occurs nine times in the New Testament, all of which are in Paul (7) or the Pastorals (2). Rom. 1:29; 13:13; I Cor. 1:11; 3:3; II Cor. 12:20; Gal. 5:20; Phil. 1:15; I Tim. 6:4; Tit. 3:9.

[162] *Op.* 11 ff.; cf. Æschylus, *Eum.* 975—νικᾷ δ' ἀγαθῶν ἔρις ἡμέτερα διὰ παντός ("Our strife to do good prevails forever").

Nothing, however, more clearly expresses the complete dissimilarity of these two teachers in their outlook on life than the reasons for their antipathy to these qualities. For Paul envy and jealousy and wrangling are to be eschewed as being unworthy of the Christian because they tend to destroy the unity of the group and are contrary to the true nature of love which envieth not.[163] Epictetus:

> You can be invincible if you enter no contest in which it is not within your own power to win. Take heed then when you observe a man surpassing others in honor or endowed with great power or in high esteem for any reason not to be carried away by outward appearance and thus pronounce him happy (μακαρίσῃς). For if the reality of good lies in what is in our power, there is no room for envy or jealousy. And you will have no desire to be a general or a prefect or a consul, but to be free. There is but one path to freedom, contempt for that which is not in our power.[164]

Paul's use of κακία[165] and πονηρία[166] has given rise to much comment and discussion. Cicero had refused to translate the former by *malitia* on the ground that the Greek term was the inclusive term opposite to virtue. Accordingly, he rendered it by *vitium*[167] or *vitiositas*.[168] In this he was following a recognized usage where κακία was contrasted with ἀρετή (virtue).[169] It is improbable that Paul displayed such a lexicographical nicety. The occurrence of the word in the midst of lists of other qualities to be censured suggests that for him it was the designation of a particular evil, or perhaps was employed merely to swell the list. Cicero's refusal to translate it by *malitia* would suggest that this rendering was in use during his day. We shall probably not err, accordingly, in understanding as did Calvin:

---

[163] I Cor. 13:4.

[164] *Ench.* 19; cf. 3, 22, 61.

[165] Rom. 1:29; I Cor. 5:8; 14:20; Eph. 4:31; Col. 3:8.

[166] Rom. 1:29; I Cor. 5:8; Eph. 6:12.

[167] *de Fin.* iii, 11, 39 f.

[168] *Tusc.* iv, 15, 34.

[169] Aristotle, *Rhet.* ii, 12 p. 1388b (ἀρετὰς καὶ κακίας); Epict. 1, 12, 16; 2, 19, 13; 2, 19, 17; 2, 23, 19 and often.

> By this term he expresses that depravity of mind which is opposed to humanity and justice, and which is usually called malignity (*malignitas*).[170]

It would appear that Trench,[171] followed by Ellicott and Lightfoot, is justified in his view that κακία is to be understood as the vicious or evil intent of the man bent on injuring others, as contrasted with πονηρία, which would signify the active exercise of such an intention. Yet the more one studies the Pauline letters the less certain he becomes that Paul was particularly concerned with using terms in strict accord with their fundamental meanings. His use of language is at best "rough and ready." Actions of which he disapproved were condemned unsparingly, and every term of abuse that lay ready at hand was employed.

SLANDER

In a previous chapter reference has been made to Paul's ban on lewd jests and filthy language.[172] In addition to these sins of the tongue (εὐτραπελία and αἰσχρολογία) he twice refers to βλασφημία.[173] This is hardly to be rendered "blasphemy" in Paul, since it signified not railing against the divine majesty, but rather the immoral act of slander against one's fellow men[174]—akin to "evil report" *i.e.*, calumny (δυσφημία),[175] "backbitings" (καταλαλία),[176] "whisperings," *i.e.*, secret slander (ψιθυρισμός)[177] —which found expression in the malicious and false accusations raised by some of the Christians against their brethren and which caused rancor and discord.

---

[170] *Commentary* upon Eph. 4:31.

[171] *Synonyms*, §xi, pp. 35 ff.

[172] Pp. 159 f.

[173] Eph. 4:31; Col. 3:8.

Nor did Paul stand alone in his opposition to this vice. The Old Testament abounds in condemnation of the evil tongue, while the rabbis were especially severe. Slander would be punished in this world by God, but complete retribution was reserved for the world to come, as in the case of the three cardinal sins; indeed, "calumny is equal to all of them." Four classes of men will never gain access to the divine presence; of these slanderers are one.[178] The similar, although not so outspoken, hatred of this vice (διαβολή),[179] expressed by many of the Greeks, is revealed in the word of Cleanthes:

> There has nothing ever existed more mischievous than slander; secretly, deceiving the man whose ear it has gained, it arouses odium against the guiltless.[180]

---

[174] So also in Matt. 12:31a; 15:19; Mark 3:28; 7:22; I Tim. 6:4; Jude 9.

[175] II Cor. 6:8. Cf. δυσφημούμενοι (I Cor. 4:13) attested by ℵ ACP and accepted by W-H, Tisch, Tr mg, Sd. It is to be observed that this was early altered to the more familiar βλασφημούμενοι. λοιδορία does not occur in Paul, although λοιδορούμενοι (I Cor. 4:12) and λοίδορος (I Cor. 5:11; 6:10) are found.

[176] II Cor. 12:20.

[177] II Cor. 12:20; cf. ψιθυριστάς Rom. 1:30.

[178] G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, ii, 148–150; cf. also *Jewish Encyclopedia*, article, "Slander," xi, p. 402.

[179] The term does not occur in Paul. The adjective διάβολος occurs three times in the Pastorals (I Tim. 3:11; II Tim. 3:3; Tit. 2:3). The difference between Paul and the Pastorals in the names of virtues and vices is highly significant.

[180] von Arnim, *Stoic. Vet. Frag.* Frg. 586, i, p. 132.

Closely allied to Paul's teaching on anger and the necessity for restraining oneself and remembering that love "suffers long and is not easily provoked," is the matter of revenge and recompense for evil. Here there seems little new in Paul's teaching. The ethics of Judaism and Stoicism alike forbade revenge. Hesiod had taught, Love your friends and hate your enemies.

> If thy friend is the first to do thee an unkindness either in word or deed, remember to return him twofold; but if he would bring thee again into friendship and consent to render thee justice, accept it.[181]

In Homer punishment was regularly retributive (*ἄντιτα ἔργα*).[182] Sin was certain; so was punishment. Forgiveness would depend on the whim of the gods. But this had changed through the years. For Plato and Seneca alike punishment was no longer retributive, but remedial. "Is not correction (*castigatio*) sometimes necessary?" Seneca asks.

> Of course it is, but with discretion, not with anger; for it does not injure, but heals under the guise of injury.[183]

Or again:

> The wise man . . . corrects not because he has received an injury, but because they have done one, and in order that they may do so no more.[184]

So to the question, "Why, if the wise man receives neither injury nor insult, does he punish those who do those things?" the answer is simple—"He is not avenging himself, but is correcting them."[185] Accordingly, the prince should be slow to punish, studying his subjects as a doctor does his patient, wrestling with their vices, and striving to bring them to a proper understanding of them,[186] for "where men are seldom punished innocence becomes the rule,"[187] while "many executions are as disgraceful to a sovereign as many funerals are to a physician."[188]

---

[181] *Op.* 709 ff.
[182] *Od.* xvii, 51, 60; *Il.* xxiv, 213.
[183] *de Ira*, 1, 6, 4.
[184] *de Const. Sap.* 12, 3.

The Christians had a responsibility before God for the brother. If he fell into temptation, his brethren were to strengthen and help him back to his sound moral condition.[189] This responsibility did not extend, however, outside the Christian group.[190] The Thessalonians were to concern themselves with the erring brethren. The loafers were to be admonished, the faint-hearted encouraged, the morally weak supported against the temptation to impurity—all to be done without censoriousness and with the recognition that they were brothers. Indeed, if the loafers refused to heed Paul's injunction that they go to work quietly, they were to be excluded, yet were not to be treated harshly nor as enemies, for, though misguided, they were brothers. The Christians were to strive to bring them back that peace and harmony might again prevail.[191]

---

[185] *de Const. Sap.* 12, 3. [186] *de Clem.* 1, 17, 1–3. [187] *Ibid.* 1, 23, 2.

[188] *Ibid.* 1, 24, 1.

[189] Gal. 6:1. προλημφθῇ is not to be understood to mean "be discovered," —*i.e.*, by his brethren—but rather "be overtaken" by sin. The context plainly shows that ἄνθρωπος refers to a member of the Christian group.

[190] Cf. I Cor. 5:10–13. Nor is this to be adduced as a blemish. It is rather an evidence of Paul's common sense.

[191] II Thes. 3:6–16.

Mutual admonition and instruction were to be practiced,[192] but censorious criticism was condemned.[193] This attitude of helpful criticism was for the good of the brother and for the whole group. Any tendency to revenge a personal grievance was unequivocally forbidden; instead of rendering evil for evil they were to strive to do good to all men, particularly their Christian brethren,[194] and leaving all retribution to God, they were to endeavor to conquer the evil spirit of their enemies by their own forgiving disposition:

"Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good" (Rom. 12:21).[195]

Having rebuked the Corinthians for summoning their fellow Christians before the heathen law courts, Paul declared that, after all, the real tragedy was that, instead of having cast all thought of revenge from their hearts, they were ready to fly at one another's throats at the smallest provocation.

> Nay, already it is altogether a defect in you, that ye have lawsuits one with another. Why not rather take wrong? why not

---

[192] Col. 3:16; cf. Rom. 15:14.

[193] I Cor. 4:1–5; Rom. 14:4 ff., 13.

[194] Rom. 12:17; I Thes. 5:15.

[195] This teaching has often been compared with the injunction in the Sermon on the Mount to resist not evil, but to turn the other cheek (Matt. 5:39), but, as Weiss has pointed out (*Paulus und Jesus*, p. 70; E. T., p. 126 f.), Paul introduces another element—the desire to put the enemy to shame. "The metaphor of the 'coals of fire' from the Proverbs adds a touch which clouds the purity of the motive expressed by Jesus. However the metaphor may be interpreted, the intention is that the enemy may feel pain and therefore change his attitude in consequence of a benefit conferred upon him." Overcoming evil with good was advocated by many teachers, Jew, Greek, and Roman alike. Cf. *Test. XII Patr.*, *Benj.* 4:3 "by doing good he overcometh evil"; Sen., *de Benefic.* 7, 31, 1, "Persistent goodness conquers evil men"; and the examples cited by Wettstein on Rom. 12:21.

> rather be defrauded? Nay, but ye yourselves do wrong, and defraud, and that your brethren.[196]

A man who acted in this manner was not walking worthily of the gospel of love, for love "seeketh not its own, . . . and taketh not account of evil."[197]

In no other phase of ethics do more noble sentiments occur than in the writings of the Stoics on precisely this subject.

> If any one is angry with you, meet his anger by returning benefits for it; . . . a contest with one's equal is of uncertain issue, with one's superior is folly, and with one's inferior is contemptible.[198]

> If you would imitate the gods . . . show kindness (*da beneficia*) even to the ungrateful, for the sun rises for the wicked and the seas lie open for pirates.[199]

Constantly Epictetus sounded the note that if one's neighbor attacks him, the truly wise man will take no revenge, for to do that means to lose one's manhood.[200]

Nor was this confined to the Greek World.

> Thou shalt not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the children of thy people; but thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself[201]

had long stood as the ideal and warning. Nor are these words to be understood as tacitly allowing—if not actually encouraging—the reverse to all who were not Israelites, as many Christian apologists have been wont to maintain. That the question as to who was one's neighbor was hotly debated by the scribes in the time of the Christian beginnings is clear not alone from the lawyer's question to Jesus,[202] but from the abundant rabbinical citations collected by Strack and Billerbeck.[203] Apparently the *ger* who was to be loved as oneself[204] came to be interpreted as the full proselyte to Judaism, and not as the foreigner as such.[205] Nor will the books of Esther and Daniel allow one to deny that there is truth in the statement:

---

[196] I Cor. 6:7 f.

[197] I Cor. 13:5. With the words ἡ ἀγάπη . . . οὐ λογίζεται τὸ κακόν (cf. Zech. 8:17) should be compared *Test. XII Pat.*, *Zeb.* 8:5 καὶ μὴ λογίζεσθε ἕκαστος κακίαν πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. The parallels often verbal between Paul and the Testaments of the Twelve are very interesting and have convinced R. H. Charles that Paul knew this writing and borrowed freely. (*The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, pp. lxxxv-xc.)

[198] *de Ira* 2, 34, 5 and 1.

[199] *de Benef.* 4, 26, 1; cf. *ibid.* 4, 28, 3; *de Otio* 1 (28), 4.

[200] 4, 5, 10 ff.; 2, 10, 24 ff.; 3, 10, 19 f.; *Ench.* 30. [201] Lev. 19:18.

> It must be noted here that at so late a period as this—the middle of the second century B. C.—the ethical conscience of the Jew found no offense in the thought of revenge upon the foes of Judaism and did not revolt against involving innocent women and children in the punitive fate of their husbands and fathers.[206]

Yet it should be observed that Esther and Daniel, written during the troublous period of the Maccabees, when the most intense hatred had been aroused toward the oppressors of Israel, must not be taken as expressing the loftiest concepts and ethical standards of Judaism.[207]

---

[202] Luke 10:29.

[203] *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Matt. 5:43 (i, pp. 353–364).

[204] Lev. 19:33–34; Deut. 10:19.

[205] Strack und Billerbeck, *loc. cit.*, in note 6. For a further discussion of the meaning of *ger* showing its change in meaning from an *advena* in Jewish territory to an *advena* in Jewish religion see G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, i, pp. 328 ff.

[206] J. M. P. Smith, *The Moral Life of the Hebrews*, p. 309.

[207] Yet even here it is perhaps not out of place to observe that God was the author of the vengeance, not man. Throughout the New Testament as well as the Old the surety of the final destruction of the wicked is stressed as

Turning from the almost fanatical zeal of these writings and of the imprecatory Psalms to the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, we find a passage illustrating the nobler aspect of the Jewish teaching:

> Love ye one another from the heart; and if a man sin against thee, speak peaceably to him, and in thy soul hold not guile; and if he repent and confess, forgive him. But if he deny it, do not get into a passion with him, lest, catching the poison from thee, he take to swearing and so thou sin doubly. And though he deny it and yet have a sense of shame when reproved, give over reproving him. For he who denieth may repent so as not again to wrong thee; yea, he may also honour thee and [fear and] be at peace with thee. But if he be shameless and persisteth in his wrong-doing, even so forgive him from the heart, and leave to God the avenging.[208]

That this teaching was not unique, passages such as Prov. 20:22; 24:29; Ecclus. 27:30–28:7 make clear. The temptation to make Christianity spring full-grown into existence without ancestry, so popular among a certain type of scholar, arises partially from the peculiar notion that the more inexplicable a phenomenon is the holier it is thereby shown to be. It was a heritage where ideas such as this on revenge and retribution had been stressed for generations that produced Christianity. When Jesus said, "Love your enemies,"[209] or Paul wrote, "Bless them that persecute

---

constantly as is the confidence in the final victory of the righteous. But God, not man, was to be the judge and was to exact the penalty. Vengeance belonged to God; man was never to presume on God's prerogative. He was to render good for evil. It is perhaps interesting to observe that while both Paul and *Autor ad Hebraeos* (Rom. 12:19, Hebr. 10:30) quoted Deut. 32:35, their emphasis was quite different. Paul meant: "Don't you avenge; leave it for God. You render good for evil." In Hebrews the inevitableness of the penalty is stressed—"God will surely repay."

[208] *Test. XII Patr., Gad* 6:3–7. [209] Matt. 5:44.

you; bless, and curse not,"[210] they were ringing true to their inheritance. Their contribution was not the creation of their noblest teachings *ex nihilo*, but the selection of them from a rubble that joined

> Thou shalt not sow thy field with two kinds of seed: neither shall there come upon thee a garment of two kinds of stuff mingled together

to "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."[211]

The contribution perhaps would have been as great in either case, although not so intelligible. Paul in all likelihood had heard, and with approval, the street corner Stoic preachers maintaining the necessity of abandoning all thoughts of vengeance. But this would have been but a repetition of a duty he had known from his earliest days, prompted not by the dictates of reason, but by the recognition that the erring man was a brother for whom Christ had died.

Paul realized that for Christians to live together in the true harmony that should characterize the groups more was necessary than scrupulous care that none transgress the rights of the other. This was essential, but it was not all. Although possessed of the loftiest ideals and with a complete devotion to duty, yet Stoicism had little cohesive force, for the reason that each Stoic was, after all, a universe in himself. The note of cosmopolitanism and of the brotherhood of man might be stressed: they, too, were members of a common body. But this "body" was not brought to life by unselfish love. Each individual would guard scrupulously against injuring his fellow; yet not because of love, but because it was his duty.

---

[210] Rom. 12:14.
[211] Lev. 19:18 f.

For Paul it was quite the reverse. Love, the fundamental virtue, the fulfillment of all law, was essentially active. Every deed and purpose must be for edification. It was not enough to fortify one's self to meet the challenges of life, to guard scrupulously against placing obstacles in the way of the other. The brother, too, must be helped. "Through love be servants one to another," he wrote to Galatia,[212] or, with a slightly different twist, "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ."[213] Of none was it more characteristic than of Paul himself. "For though I was free from all men, I brought myself under bondage to all, that I might gain the more."[214] "Becoming all things to all men" was not a sign of vacillation or weakness—few men have been less liable to the charge of toadying. Its purpose was the salvation of mankind. The corporate nature of the Christian life, the recognition of the tie that joined each to the other, stands as clearly revealed here as it does in the later Colossians and Ephesians.

This bond of fellowship was so intimate that each could participate in the brother's sense of guilt. Impossible for the Stoic, who, though ready to help the one in distress, could never mingle his own tears; the tie that held the Christians in fellowship—fellow members of Christ's body—was so real that each must recognize as his own the misfortunes and the joys of the other. "Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is caused to stumble, and I burn not?"[215] Not alone was this true for Paul. It must be the experience of every Christian. By such an attitude all tendency to arrogance and the feeling of superiority would be rendered impossible.

---

[212] Gal. 5:13. With this should be compared Seneca's measured and practical advice:

"For truly is it demanded of man that he be of use to his fellows; to the many, if this be possible; if not, to the few, to his neighbors, at least to himself. For when one makes himself of service to others he performs a common task." (*de Otio* 3 (30), 5). Cf. also *Ep. Mor.* 104, 3; M. Aurel. 6, 30. Constant emphasis upon service was laid by every Stoic teacher.

[213] Gal. 6:2.

[214] I Cor. 9:19.

Sophocles had said, "Take it all in all, I deem a man's first duty is to serve himself."[216] Constantly in the dialogue *de Brevitate Vitæ* Seneca stressed the same note. With complete lack of affectation he urged that a man should live for self. Urging leisure for the "higher life," he wrote:

> Are you not ashamed to reserve only the leavings of your life for yourself, and to appoint for the enjoyment of your own right mind only that time which you cannot devote to any business?[217]

The truly wise man's life will be long "because he devotes every possible part of it to himself."[218] In contrast to this ideal was Paul's emphasis on the life of service. "I will most gladly spend and be spent for your souls";[219] he was ready to be offered, poured out as libation.[220] Priscilla and Aquila, who had apparently undergone some danger to help him,[221] Phœbe's[222] attitude of helpfulness—this was the ideal he held before his churches. The strong were to bear the infirmities of the weak.[223]

---

[215] II Cor. 11:29.

[216] Soph., *Antig.* 439 f. (437 f.)—
ἀλλὰ πάντα ταῦθ' ἥσσω λαβεῖν
ἐμοὶ πέφυκε τῆς ἐμῆς σωτηρίας.

[217] *de Brev. Vit.* 3, 5.

[218] *Ibid.* 7, 5 et passim.

RELIEF OF POOR

One very practical form of service was that of relief of the poor. In Rom. 12:13 the duty of sharing one's possessions with fellow Christians in want was urged; in Eph. 4:28 the being in a position to help a distressed worthy brother was given as a motive for honest labor. The giving of alms had been constantly taught in the Old Testament. "Thou shalt surely open thine hand unto thy brother, to thy needy, and to thy poor, in thy land.[224] The gleanings of the field were to be left for the poor and the sojourner.[225] Nor was it less stressed in later Judaism. The giving of charity out of pity came to have in itself a meritorious power.

> Water will quench a blazing fire;
> And almsgiving will make atonement for sins. [226]

Or again:

> Shut up alms in thy store-chambers;
> And it shall deliver thee out of all afflictions.[227]

---

[219] II Cor. 12:15. [220] Phil. 2:17. [221] Rom. 16:4. [222] Rom. 16:2.

[223] Rom. 15:1.

[224] Deut. 15:11.

[225] Lev. 19:9 f.; 23:22; Deut. 24:19–22. Cf. also the story of Ruth (chap. 2).

[226] Ecclus. 3:30.

[227] Ecclus. 29:12; cf. Tobit 4:10, 11; 12:8, 9. For the whole matter of Jewish charity see G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, ii, pp. 162–179.

The obligation of the Gentile churches to contribute to the relief of the poor at Jerusalem was constantly stressed by Paul. The only condition of partnership between himself and the Jerusalem apostles that he mentions,[228] he felt a moral obligation for its performance.[229] Rom. 15:25 ff., I Cor. 16:1 ff.,[230] II Cor. 8 and 9 reveal the seriousness of the obligation in the eyes of Paul and the means he took to spur his churches to activity. To the Corinthians he cited the generosity that prompted the Christians in Macedonia, poor though they were, to contribute; he reminded the Corinthians in turn that he had mentioned their generosity in Macedonia. Their gifts were to be freely offered, not grudgingly nor of necessity, for God loved the cheerful giver.[231] It was an opportunity for actual participation in the life of the brother. The word κοινωνία, used in Rom. 15:26, II Cor. 8:4, 9:13, was well calculated to stress the note of fellowship, as in Rom. 12:13 the word κοινωνοῦντες ("contributing," *i.e.*, sharing) rather than the colorless διδόντες (giving), emphasized the bond of fellowship that linked them together. It was not that giving alms had for Paul the objective value that it came to have for many Jews, but that the man whose life was dictated by the spirit of love and who recognized the tie that bound him to his fellow Christian could not fail to do all in his power to relieve the latter's need.

---

[228] Gal. 2:10. [229] Rom. 15:27.

[230] With this direction of Paul for each Christian to lay by him in store on the first day of the week should be compared the Jewish practice of sending two collectors through the municipality every Friday to take up the weekly collection for the needy. See Moore, *Judaism*, ii, pp. 174 f.

[231] II Cor. 9:7.

WEALT

Regarding the matter of wealth, Paul had much less to say than most moralists in his day. Nor is the reason hard to discover. The question would be of little moment among the majority of the Christian converts. It would be wrong to suppose all the early Christians were slaves; but while there were occasional figures like Philemon and Chloe, the rank and file of the Christians made up an audience quite different from that, for example, of the courtier Seneca. Yet it is significant to observe that the scathing indictments of the rich which occur in the Epistle of James find no parallel in the Pauline letters.

It is to be observed that words like φιλαργυρία,[232] φιλάργυρος,[233] αισχροκερδής,[234] which occur in the Pastorals are entirely absent from the genuine Pauline epistles. Nor can πλεονεξία[235] be limited to the narrow sense of covetousness. Rather it seems to have had the more inclusive meaning of actual wrong done to another. The πλεονέκτης[236] is the "wronger," harmer, despoiler. Whether or not the noun itself connotes sexual impurity has been long a matter of dispute. Trench[237] maintains that it does; Lightfoot,[238] on the contrary, asserts that it never in itself has that meaning. To me the evidence seems slightly in favor of the latter view. Not in itself signifying sexual impurity, it may yet be used of it, as, for example, of adultery,[239] since the man who was guilty of this act was wronging his neighbor and disregarding the brother's rights by debauching his wife and invading the sanctity (cf. ὑπερβαίνειν) of his home. The offense was dictated by selfishness, the taproot of all vice for Paul, and that which rendered impossible the true *koinonia* which should characterize brethren.

---

[232] I Tim. 6:10. [233] II Tim. 3:2.

[234] I Tim. 3:8; Tit. 1:7.

[235] Rom. 1:29; II Cor. 9:5; Eph. 4:19; 5:3; Col. 3:5; I Thes. 2:5. It is interesting to observe that πλεονεξία, which in the New Testament regularly is used in a bad sense, is used by Epictetus (2, 10, 9) in the sense of advantage, but not at the expense of another:

"For see what a thing it is to gain for yourself goodness of disposition at the price, perchance, of a head of lettuce or of a (magistrate's?) seat—how great the advantage (ὅση ἡ πλεονεξία)."

[236] I Cor. 5:10, 11; 6:10; Eph. 5:5.

[237] *Synonyms* §xxiv, p. 80.

[238] *St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians* (on 3:5), p. 210.

As a condition of discipleship Jesus had demanded the complete surrender of wealth,[240] apparently regarding it as inherently deceitful and of the nature to enslave its possessor to such a degree that only by a miracle could the rich man enter the kingdom of God. His disciples must be care free and of undivided allegiance.[241] From the book of Acts it would appear that at first the early disciples in Jerusalem attempted literal obedience to this clear teaching, but with disastrous results. The experiment was not repeated. The common-sense attitude of the Shepherd of Hermas to the matter of wealth suggests that as the years went by and wealthy men became attracted to the church, this earlier teaching of Jesus was quite neglected.[242]

---

[239] Cf. πλεονεκτεῖν, I Thes. 4:6. See also p. 157.

[240] Mark 10:21 ff. and parallels.

[241] Cf. Matt. 6:19 ff.

[242] For a fuller discussion of Jesus' attitude toward wealth see my articles, "The Essential Principles of Christian Morality as Gathered from the New Testament," *Crozer Quarterly*, vol. v, no. 3 (July, 1928), esp. pp. 280–289, and "An Additional Step toward the Understanding of Jesus," *Journal of Religion*, vol. ix, no. 3 (July, 1929), pp. 428 f.

There seems to have been no complete agreement on this matter in the Greek-speaking world. In the period of the greatest luxury there was a strong reaction on the part of many and an increasing praise of poverty. The simple life without ostentation served Horace as the subject for several of his odes. The famous saying of Epicurus preserved by Seneca reveals the attitude of the Epicureans:

> If you desire to make Pithocles rich, you must not add to his wealth but detract from his desires.[243]

Yet there was no general renunciation of wealth for poverty. The Stoics taught that, though it was difficult for a rich man to be temperate (σωφρονῶν) or a righteous man to be rich,[244] yet one should cease forbidding philosophers to possess money. "No one has condemned wisdom to poverty," wrote Seneca.[245] The danger lay not in possessing money, but in worshiping it.[246] To the man that objected that Seneca had said, "I will despise riches as much when I have them as when I have them not,"[247] he retorted, "These things ought to be despised, not that he should not possess them."[248] Then follows a very sensible remark that the wise man who was at the same time rich would have a far greater opportunity for developing his powers than if he were poor;[249] but that the judicious giving of charity was a difficult task, and should never be done impulsively, but with the recognition that "wherever there is a human being, there is an opportunity for a benefit."

---

[243] *Fgm.* 135 Usener; Sen., *Ep. Mor.* 21, 7.

[244] Cf. the sayings of the different schools collected by Stobæus, *Florileg.* x, *Περὶ ἀδικίας καὶ φιλαργυρίας καὶ πλεονεξίας* (ed. Meineke, 1855, i, pp. 231–244).

[245] *de Vit. Beat.* 23, 1.

[246] With I Tim. 6:10, "For the love of money (φιλαργυρία) is a root of all kinds of evil" should be compared the saying attributed to Bion (Stob., *loc. cit.* 38): Βίων ὁ σοφιστὴς τὴν φιλαγυρίαν μητρόπολιν ἔλεγε πάσης κακίας εἶναι.

[247] *de Vit. Beat.* 20, 3.

[248] *de Vit. Beat.* 21, 2.

Similarly, for Paul poverty was no mark of piety or devotion.[250] The rich were criticized for their selfish behavior at the Lord's supper in putting the poor to shame. It was their selfishness, however, which tended to disrupt the social harmony, not their riches, that incurred Paul's reproach.

While the specific injunction,

> Upon the first day of the week let each one of you lay by him in store, as he may prosper,[251]

was concerned with the collection for Jerusalem, there seems little ground for doubting that Paul's principle that the strong were to bear the burdens of the weak would have been applied by him to include in general the "communicating to the necessities of the saints." This relief was necessary to link all the brethren together; yet it was never to be used to encourage laziness. This is clearly seen in his treatment of the trouble in Thessalonica.[252] The loafers were to stop demanding that they be supported in idleness by the rest of the church and were to get to work. Their idleness not only laid an unnecessary burden on the church, but also exposed the group to reproach from non-Christians. Instead of yielding to feverish excitement arising from the expected near approach of the Parousia, they were to earn their own bread. The maxim was "If any will not work, neither let him eat."[253]

---

[249] *de Vit. Beat.* 22, 1. Cf. Shepherd of Hermas, *Sim.* 2, 1–10.

[250] I Cor. 1:28 is not to be construed in contradiction of this statement. The ideal was for each man by his work to be independent; cf. I Thes. 4:11; II Thes. 3:8, 12.

[251] I Cor. 16:2.

[252] I Thes. 4:10b–12; II Thes. 3:6–15.

Paul himself had scrupulously refrained from becoming dependent upon the charity of his churches, although as an apostle he might perfectly well have accepted support. It was his boast that he had given the gospel free to the Corinthians.[254] Though in want, he had refused to be dependent upon them, but had preferred help from the Philippians,[255] for whom he had a great affection.[256] But he was loath to accept even their gifts, and preferred to earn his own living by manual labor,[257] agreeing with Hesiod,

> Not work but idleness is reproach.[258]

This independence on the part of Paul is paralleled by many of the most eminent Jewish scholars who supported themselves and their families by manual labor.[259]

---

[253] II Thes. 3:10. Whether or not Paul originated this maxim (as Frame, *ICC* in loc., suggests) is uncertain. The parallels given by Wettstein throw little light on the matter. Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*,^{4} p. 314, comments:

"As a matter of fact, St. Paul was probably borrowing a bit of good old workshop morality, a maxim applied no doubt hundreds of times by industrious workmen as they forbade a lazy apprentice to sit down to dinner." This suggestion has the advantage of being as completely free from the possibility of refutation as it is of proof.

[254] I Cor. 9:18; II Cor. 11:7.

[255] II Cor. 11:8 f.; cf. Phil. 4:16.

[256] Didache 11:3–12:5; Shepherd of Hermas, *Mand.* 11; the warnings in the Pastoral Epistles that bishops and deacons be not greedy reveal that not all travelling teachers were as scrupulous as Paul.

[257] I Thes. 2:9; II Thes. 3:8.

[258] *Op.* 311 (ἔργον δ'οὐδὲν ὄνειδος, ἀεργίη δὲ τ'ὄνειδος).

Though Seneca advocated leisure for contemplation—only so could a man live according to nature[260]—it was never laziness nor idleness. Against such an attitude he says:

> We [*i.e.*, the Stoics] are the sect that gives no discharge for any number of years' service, and in the words of the most eloquent of poets, (*i.e.*, Virgil, *Æn.* ix, 612) "We wear the helmet while our locks are gray."[261]

Nevertheless, he did feel that Turannius' refusal to be pensioned at the age of ninety was carrying the matter to an extreme.[262]

Closely akin to the relief of the poor was the duty of hospitality ("Communicating to the necessities of the saints; given to hospitality").[263] Little need be said of the great emphasis the ancients laid on hospitality, a virtue which was rendered highly necessary by the infrequency of inns and other places of public entertainment. Lot's willingness to sacrifice his own daughters to the Sodomites rather than surrender his guests who have eaten with him[264] reveals the horror the Oriental felt of breaking the law of hospitality. Nor was this confined to the Hebrews. Homer's words are well known:

> The herdsman, that had gifts in him divine,
> Replied: "O guest, how shall this fame of mine
> And honest virtue, amongst men, remain

---

[259] G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, ii, p. 177.

[260] *de Otio* 5 (31), 1; cf. *de Brev. Vit.* 18, 1 ff.

[261] *de Otio* 1(28), 4.

[262] *de Brev. Vit.* 20, 3.

[263] Rom. 12:13.

[264] Gen. 19:4–11.

Now, and hereafter, without worthy stain,
If I, that led thee to my hovel here,
And made thee fitting hospitable cheer,
Should after kill thee, and thy loved mind
Force from thy bones? Or how should stand inclined
With any faith my will t'importune Jove,
In any prayer hereafter for his love?[265]

Indeed, breach of hospitality with disregard for one's oath and the failure to honor one's parents comprised the Homeric triad of cardinal sins.

Nor was it merely restrained to protecting the man once received. Jesus' action in using one man's colt[266] and another man's room[267] with "splendid simplicity" was rendered possible under the Eastern laws of hospitality. Nor was it different among the early Christians. Paul had no hesitation in asking Philemon to provide him lodging.[268] Phœbe[269] would of course be received with Christian hospitality and accorded whatever assistance she should need.[270] That this expression of Christian fellowship was misused by those "making traffic of Christ" has been remarked.[271]

The man who was actually "in Christ," in whom the change from death to life had been a reality, and who had thus a character conformed to Christ's own, must of necessity recognize the intimate tie that bound him to his fellow—a tie which could be maintained only as each served the other in love. "Let all things be done unto edifying,"[272] accordingly, cannot be restricted to an admonition *ad hoc* for the regulation of worship at Corinth, but was an underlying principle of Paul's thought—an essential requirement for walking worthily of the gospel.

---

[265] *Od.* xiv, 401–406 (Chapman's translation).
[266] Mark 11:3 ff.
[267] Mark 14:14 ff.
[268] Philm. 22.
[269] Rom. 16:1 f.
[270] Cf. also Hebr. 13:2; III John; I Pet. 4:9; I Tim. 3:2; 5:10; Tit. 1:8; Shepherd of Hermas, *Sim.* 9, 27.
[271] See p. 291, n. 256.

---

[272] I Cor. 14:26.

◆◆

Chapter XI—Rejoice in the Lord Always: Again I Will Say, Rejoice

It is impossible to rise from reading Epictetus or Marcus Aurelius without a sense of constraint and melancholy, without feeling that the burden laid upon man is wellnigh greater than he can bear. Honor to the sages who have felt this, and yet have borne it! Yet, even for the sage, this sense of labor and sorrow in his march toward the goal constitutes a relative inferiority; the noblest souls of whatever creed, the pagan Empedocles as well as the Christian Paul, have insisted on the necessity of an inspiration, a joyful emotion, to make moral action perfect; . . . But, for the ordinary man, this sense of labor and sorrow constitutes an absolute disqualification; it paralyzes him; under the weight of it, he cannot make way towards the goal at all. The paramount virtue of religion is, that it has *lighted up* morality; that it has supplied the emotion and inspiration needful for carrying the sage along the narrow way perfectly, for carrying the ordinary man along it at all.[1]

MATTHEW ARNOLD has put his finger upon a real difference between the teaching of Paul and that of the Stoic. Seneca had written, "A poor soldier is he who follows his commander with groans;"[2] in this brief word the temper of his thought stands revealed—uncomplaining steadfastness, complete tranquillity of mind through freedom from outside distractions. In contrast to this teaching comes the more positive note of Paul "Rejoice in the Lord always: again I will say,

---

[1] Matthew Arnold, "Marcus Aurelius," *Essays in Criticism* (Boston 1866), pp. 254 f.

[2] *Ep. Mor.* 107, 9.

Rejoice."[3] It was not enough to refrain from complaining. One's whole life must be a constant expression of joyful thanksgiving to God for his unspeakable gift. The nature of the Christian hope was such that "rejoicing in hope" was a natural sequel to "serving the Lord."[4] Indeed, with righteousness and peace, joy stands as one of the three characteristics of the kingdom of God.[5] Among the fruits of the spirit it is put second only to love;[6] "helpers (συνεργοί) of your joy" signifies "fellow Christians."[7] Here we find the last of the four fundamental principles of Paul's ethics: the need of joyful anticipation.

In Rom. 8 Paul developed the ground for this joyful confidence. The fact of suffering was not to be denied. As we have seen,[8] Paul met this problem squarely. But the suffering, while severe, was never to dim their confidence and hope. In verses 18 ff. he gave three grounds for their encouragement. (1) The future glory would so far outweigh the present suffering that the latter was not worthy to be mentioned in the same breath.[9] The same note is constantly sounded in his writings. In Eph. 1:16 ff. he told his readers that he was constantly praying that their eyes be opened to the exceeding riches in Christ that were theirs; the wealth of the glory that the saint had inherited as an adopted son of God,

[3] Phil. 4:4; cf. 3:1; I Thes. 5:16.
[4] Rom. 13:12.
[5] Rom. 14:17.
[6] Gal. 5:22.
[7] II Cor. 1:24.
[8] Pp. 224 ff.
[9] Rom. 8:18–25.

since the raising of Christ from the dead was the sure proof of God's power to strengthen them. The conviction that the temptation was never too grievous to be borne, that suffering was but part of the Father's plan, that forgiveness was a glorious reality, contributed to the optimism so characteristic of the apostle.

(2) A second ground for encouragement was the fact that the Holy Spirit supported them.[10] The belief of the early church, as clearly revealed in Acts, that they were from time to time endowed with the Holy Spirit, and thus enabled to undergo emotional excitement such as glossolalia, to perform miracles, and to do other wonderful deeds,[11] is not without parallel in the writings of Paul.[12] But in addition to this spectacular function is his emphasis that it is operative in the life of the saints as a help and spur to ethical conduct.[13] This consciousness that they were not left alone in a hostile world, but that God's own Spirit, nay God himself, was at work in them, supplying that which was lacking, gave a needed encouragement.

(3) Furthermore, the Christian could have the confidence that God caused all things to work for the best interests of those who loved him.[14] With God for them opposition from evil was unavailing; though it might be

---

[10] Rom. 8:26, 27.

[11] See further my article, "An Additional Step toward the Understanding of Jesus," *Journal of Religion*, vol. ix, no. 3 (July, 1929), esp. pp. 431 ff.

[12] Cf. Rom. 15:19; I Cor. 2:10, 12, 13, 14; 12:3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13; 14:2; Gal. 3:2, 5; I Thes. 5:19.

[13] Rom. 5:5; 8:9, 13, 14, 15b, 16a; 15:13, 16; I Cor. 2:4; 3:16; Gal. 4:6; 5:5, 16, 17, 18, 22, 25; Eph. 1:13, 17; 2:18; 3:16; 4:3; 6:17, 18; Phil. 2:1; 3:3; I Thes. 1:5, 6; 4:8; II Thes. 2:13.

[14] Rom. 8:28–39.

fierce, in the end it could not prevail. Nothing could separate them from the love of Christ. With the measured caution, so characteristic of Seneca—

> For it is not because of us that the universe brings back winter and summer; these have their own laws, by which the divine plan operates. We have too high a regard for ourselves if we deem ourselves worthy to be the cause of such mighty movements. Therefore none of these phenomena takes place for the purpose of injuring us; on the contrary none that does not tend toward our benefit—[15]

Paul's contagious optimism, "And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good," stands in striking contrast.

Such an outlook on life could not fail to have a tremendous effect on moral conduct. This wonderful hope that lay before the Christian, the consciousness that he was to have a place in the eternal destiny of the world, did not free from moral responsibility. There was no condemnation for those who were in Christ Jesus, but that was not synonymous with all who had been baptized. The fact of being in Christ was alone revealed by the reality of the new life and the actual possession of a character conformed to Christ's own. All men, Christians as well as heathens, must stand before the judgment bar.[16] But to those really in Christ it would not be a day of condemnation, but of reward and honor. Under the figure of the wild olive he warned:

> Be not high minded, but fear: for if God spared not the natural branches, neither will he spare thee. Behold then the goodness and

---

[15] *de Ira* 2, 27, 2. [16] Rom. 14:10; II Cor. 5:10.

> severity of God: toward them that fell, severity; but toward thee, God's goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.[17]

The fact of divine retribution on the basis of moral action was constantly stressed.[18] As the seed, so the crop; but this need not dim the Christians' hope. For them it was not a day of wrath, "For God appointed us not unto wrath, but unto the obtaining of salvation through our Lord Jesus Christ."[19] They were to work out their own salvation,[20] with the recognition that the good was not their own doing but God's; yet ever with the confidence that God would advance them in grace, fully preparing them to meet successfully the day of trial.[21]

An important note in Paul's teaching is his emphasis on the coming age and his confidence that then the scale would be reversed. For example, it made no difference what sort of treatment the slave received from the master. He was to serve faithfully, confident that he would receive his reward later.[22] This gives a cross-section of Paul's thinking. The present age with its hardships, the constant warfare with Satan and his demons, was a dreadful reality. If this struggle were the only thing to which the Christian could look forward, he might despair, but the future age, when all this would be changed, was almost upon them. A short time now and the goal would be won. Happiness was thus projected beyond this life. This may well be the real reason that the term εὐδαιμονία (happiness) was excluded from the Christian vocabulary. Its exclusion is all the more remarkable since almost every ethical system in the Greek world, regardless of other differences, agreed in making this the aim of human desire, as the great majority of people do today.

---

[17] Rom. 11:20–22.

[18] Rom. 2:1–16; I Cor. 3:13; 6:9, 10; Gal. 5:21b; 6:7–10; Eph. 6:8; Col. 3:24; I Thes. 4:6.

[19] I Thes. 5:9.

[20] Phil. 2:12.

[21] Phil. 1:6.

[22] Eph. 6:5–8; Col. 3:22–25.

> What is the highest of all the goods which are objects of moral action? So far as name goes there is a pretty general harmony of opinion, for the *hoi polloi* and men of taste alike say "happiness," and consider "living well" and "doing well" the same as "being happy."[23]

Even those who reject happiness as a goal find a decided pleasure in so doing and are but chasing it under a different guise. The term ἡδονή (pleasure) is not found in Paul, although it occurs five times in the New Testament, signifying in each case a vice to be shunned.[24] Its mere association with Epicureanism[25] would have been sufficient to have negatived its influence on Jewish and Christian writers whose hatred of Epicureanism was only surpassed by their ignorance of what it actually was. Happiness and pleasure, because essentially limited to "mundane and temporal" gratification, could not have a place in a system of thought such as Paul's, where rewards and joys were transferred from the present world to the world to come.

---

[23] Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* i, 2 (4, 2), p. 1095a (τί τὸ πάντων ἀκρότατον τῶν πρακτῶν ἀγαθῶν. ὀνόματι μὲν οὖν σχεδὸν ὑπὸ τῶν πλείστων ὁμολογεῖται τὴν γὰρ εὐδαιμονίαν καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ οἱ χαρίεντες λέγουσιν, τὸ δ'εὖ ζῆν καὶ τὸ εὖ πράττειν ταὐτὸν ὑπολαμβάνουσι τῷ εὐδαιμονεῖν). For the attitude of the Stoa see pp. 19 ff.

[24] Luke 8:14; Tit. 3:3; Jas. 4:1, 3; II Pet. 2:13.

[25] Not as an end in itself, but to be pursued as a means to εὐδαιμονία.

To many today the words, "If we have only hoped in Christ in this life, we are of all men most pitiable,"[26] strike a false note—as if for Paul right because it was right was not a sufficient motive. The uncompromising morality of the Stoic—"virtue for virtue's sake"—seems on a higher plane. Many Jews feel this way and cite with approval the attitude of the Jew who did right and kept the Torah because he loved to do so and with no thought of external rewards. "Do the words of the law for the doing's sake, and discuss them for their own sake."[27] Paul himself was a Jew and, as has been constantly stressed, one with the highest standards of morality. It is at once cruel and senseless to interpret I Cor. 15:19 with the unimaginative literalness which would make him mean: The only reason we do not do (the more pleasurable) evil is simply because we are expecting a great reward.

The uncompromising attitude which Paul shows to evil on every page of his letters reveals the illegitimate nature of such an interpretation. But Paul was a practical man. As he could *be* all things to all people to save them, so he would *use* all means. Christianity was not the powerful agency then that it is today, but a new and struggling faith, striving to inculcate many ideas contrary to the thought of the times. With the opposition that was bound to come from all sides, and without the prestige of an old faith, many of the converts to whom being moral and being religious were quite distinct were in grave danger of all sorts of abuses.[28] Rewards and penalities, after all, constitute the motive to which the majority of mankind is most amenable. Most moral teachers, however much they may deplore the fact, are aware of it and do not scruple to make use of it. So Paul. Better to spur men to do what was right, even though an inferior motive were stressed, than to leave them in sin.

---

[26] I Cor. 15:19.

[27] R. Eleazar b. Zadok, Sifrè Deut §48 (end), quoted by G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, ii, p. 97.

But his emphasis on the nearness of the Parousia—it would come within his lifetime he seems confidently to have expected—never led him to the excesses that were ready at hand. The group at Thessalonica, which had been thrown into confusion by its expectation of the speedy approach of the end, was sharply rebuked: they were to be at rest in their minds, to mind their own business, to quit meddling with the affairs of the brotherhood, and to work quietly. The belief in the speedy end of the age tended to quicken both the religious and the moral earnestness of the early Christian.[29] He must be constantly alert that his house be in order. He lived in the world, but was not of the world.

This emphasis on the glorious fate in store for the pious was not unique to Paul. It was a part of the "stage-properties" of apocalypticism. To encourage the faithful in their time of danger and depression the magnificence of the future blessing near at hand was stressed. Indeed, in Syriac Baruch, which is apparently a product of the first century, after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., a phrase completely parallel with I Cor. 15:19, if not dependent on it, occurs. "For if there were this life only which belongs to all men, nothing could be more bitter than this."[30]

---

[28] It has been aptly said that the problem today is just the reverse of the one in the days of Paul. Then it was to make religion moral; today it is to make morality religious.

[29] Cf. Rom. 13:11 ff. and constantly.

Anxiety and harassing care are forbidden.[31] Instead of morbidly brooding or anxiously dreading the approaching end Paul urged a complete dependence on and confidence in God for future blessings with gratitude for those in the past. To give thanks unto the Father,[32] to give thanks always for all things,[33] instead of engaging in light and foolish talk to engage rather in the giving of thanks[34]—this befitted the Christian. The spirit of gratitude which should characterize the Christian appears in almost every page of his writings.[35] Nor was the phrase, "I thank my God upon all my remembrance of you,"[36] a mere *usus loquendi.* In every act of life God's blessing was to be seen and man's gratitude expressed. "And whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him."[37]

In a previous chapter[38] Paul's attitude toward arrogance and self-confidence has been considered at some length. While such an attitude was deprecated, yet a strong confidence in God and the conviction of final success was the tonic that was to nerve his converts to endure the opposition which was destined to blaze up the more furiously immediately preceding the final victory. But *παρρησία*[39] (boldness, confidence), signifying freedom in expression and thought, is entirely free from the unpleasant connotation that gradually began to be present in *καύχησις*. The sense in Jas. 4:16[40] is but the last step in the decay of the latter word from its original good use to its condemnation to a bad use alone. Arrogance was blameworthy, but boldness was justified. II Cor. 3:12 gives the key to Paul's thought. His boldness had been criticized by a group at Corinth as indicating his tyranny. To this charge he retorted that the covenant of which he was the minister was so glorious that he had the right, nay the duty, to *παρρησία*, which was actually the badge of the servant of Christ. Not alone the obligation to frankness on the part of the apostle, even though it led to speaking unpleasant truths,[41] but the attitude of undoubting confidence in the reality of their fellowship with God should characterize every Christian. "In whom [*sc.* Christ] we have boldness and access in confidence through our faith in him."[42]

---

[30] Syriac Baruch 21:13; cf. also 72:1–74:4.
[31] Phil. 4:6.
[32] Col. 1:12.
[33] Eph. 5:20.
[34] Eph. 5:4.
[35] As, for example, Col. 2:7; 3:15; 4:2; I Thes. 5:18.
[36] Phil. 1:3; cf. Rom. 1:8; I Cor. 1:4; Col. 1:3; I Thes. 1:2; II Thes. 1:3; 2:13.
[37] Col. 3:17.
[38] Pp. 254 ff.

---

[39] II Cor. 3:12; 7:4; Eph. 3:12; 6:19; Phil. 1:20; Col. 2:15; Philm. 8.

[40] *νῦν δὲ καυχᾶσθε ἐν ταῖς ἀλαζονίαις ὑμῶν· πᾶσα καύχησις τοιαύτη πονηρά ἐστιν.*

[41] Gal. 4:16.

[42] Eph. 3:12. This would seem to be the only passage in which boldness toward God is mentioned; regularly it is boldness toward men inspired through confidence in the call from God. But this usage easily acquired a prominent

This confidence that the future would more than make amends for the present and that the delay would not be long led to *contentment*—not the finding of satisfaction in temporal pleasures, but in the anticipation of future blessings. Here is revealed another real contrast with Stoicism. Seneca could say:

> All the greatest blessings are enjoyed with fear, and nothing is so untrustworthy as extreme prosperity. . . . Everything for which we are dependent upon chance is uncertain; the higher it rises the more opportunity it has of falling.[43]

And the Stoic was thus driven in upon himself for the realities of life, determining to uproot all emotion and to desire nothing external to himself.

> Idiot! what difference can it make on what part of the couch you rest? Can a cushion add to your honor or your disgrace?[44]

With his gaze toward the coming age soon to be revealed, Paul could say:

> Not that I speak in respect of want; for I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therein to be content. I know how to be abased, and I know also how to abound: in everything and in all things have I learned the secret both to be filled and to be hungry, both to abound and to be in want. I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me.[45]

This is the gist of Paul's philosophy of life. His freedom in Christ had freed him not alone from the law, but

---

place in Christian thinking. Cf. Hebr. 3:6; 4:16; 10:19, 35; I John 2:28; 3:21; 4:17; 5:14. Confidence in one's salvation was a part of saving faith for Martin Luther, though denied by the Council of Trent, which decided that no one could know whether or not he would be saved without a special revelation from God. [43] *de Brev. Vit.* 17, 4. [44] *de Ira* 3, 37, 4.

[45] Phil. 4:11 ff.

from external circumstances as well.[46] Abasement or exaltation, plenty or want—these were of secondary importance to him. He had been initiated into Christ, and in his veins he felt the life-giving strength enabling him to meet every difficulty. There was, accordingly, a real difference from the all-sufficiency of the Stoic,[47] though the similarity in form tends to obscure the fact.

The paralyzing feeling of despair and of the hopelessness of the task, which caused so many to turn away from the stern teaching of the Stoics to find assurance in the teaching of the Oriental mysteries, whence as Cicero said, they "attained the art of living joyfully and dying with a fairer hope,"[48] was fully met by Paul. The world was evil, but that did not matter. The Christian was no longer of the world; he had died to the world and had been raised to a new life. Satan and his demons were real, and were constantly striving to cause the Christians to faint; but Christ was more powerful than they. Nothing could separate the believer from his Lord.

[46] Ἀπάθεια (see p. 22 f.) and ἀταραξία which were so prominent in Stoic and Epicurean ethics, are not mentioned in the New Testament. αὐτάρκεια and αὐτάρκης each occur once in the writings of Paul (II Cor. 9:8; Phil. 4:11), the former also occurs in I Tim. 6:6. Plato's remark (*Rep.* ii, p. 369B), οὐκ αὐτάρκης ἀλλὰ πολλῶν ἐνδεής, reveals its meaning. The idea itself was popular with all Greek sects. Stobæus, *Florileg.* v, 43—Σωκράτης πρὸς τὸν πυθόμενον τίς πλουσιώτατος εἶπεν ὁ ἐλάχιστος ἀρκούμενος. αὐτάρκεια γὰρ φύσεώς ἐστι πλοῦτος.

[47] As in the case of most Greek thinkers, for Philo the end of moral conduct was pleasure, but in the sense of living in accord with the highest excellence. In antithesis to the *summum bonum* was self-conceit—*i.e.*, the ascription of achievement to the νοῦς ποιητικός (man's creative intellect) instead of to the Logos or universal mind. Here he broke with the Stoics with whom he was otherwise in general agreement regarding ethical principles. For them man was self-sufficient for the achievement of virtue leading to the *summum bonum.*

[48] See p. 53.

> Wherefore we faint not; but though our outward man is decaying, yet our inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal.[49]

It was this deathless hope, springing not from within himself, but from the Lord in whom he lived, who had triumphed signally over death and sin, and was even then at hand, which explains the apostle to the Gentiles. While in the great games all the athletes strove for the prize, which was nothing but a perishable garland, the Christian athletes were assured of one that would never fade; and while but one of the runners might secure the prize, every Christian who walked worthily of the gospel would receive it,[50] "for," as he wrote the Galatians with a change of figure, "in due season we shall reap, if we faint not."[51]

[49] II Cor. 4:16–18.
[50] I Cor. 9:24–27.
[51] Gal. 6:9.

PAUL wrote his occasional letters for his day and generation. The problem of his churches, the questions they asked him, the abuses he saw needing correction, the dangers he feared might arise both from a mistaken attitude on the part of those within or through attack from those without—these were the matters that concerned him. Little did he think that he was writing for future generations. The age was soon to pass away and the better day to dawn; yet this view of the transitory nature of human society, that has so often in the history of Christianity unbalanced life and thought, had little effect on his teaching. To be sure, he urged it as a reason for avoiding the married state; yet for the most part this expectation acted merely as a spur to nobler living. Though he expected this world to end on the morrow, he taught as if it would last forever.

In many ways Christianity has changed since the days of the apostle. Many of his problems no longer concern us. Others have arisen of which he never dreamed. His rugged honesty, his hatred of sham, his conviction that as God's apostle he must speak the truth which God had given him, sometimes offend us as they did those of his own day; he did not fight as one beating the air. No word was more characteristic of his life than περισσοτέρως. Whatever he did, he did with his might.

Before his conversion this had marked his attempt to destroy the church;[1] after his conversion it marked his work for Christ,[2] and his love for his churches.[3] He was primarily a περισσοτέρως man.

Justification by faith has been heralded as Paul's great contribution. And to an extent it was. But faith was not a creed; it was a life—the new life which the man who had found fellowship with Christ lived in him. It was the new character he bore conformed to Christ's own. It made great demands, but it brought with it sufficient strength. The man to whom this experience had come was ἅγιος—set apart for Christ. No longer was he of the world. All that defiled—the sins of the flesh—was behind him. Though sufferings and temptations assailed him, he must stand without faltering. The same bond that linked him with his Lord linked him also with his brethren to whom the same mystery had been revealed. He could fulfill his obligations to Christ only as he served his fellow Christians in love. Nor was it to be with sorrow. The world was evil, but Christ had overcome the world. The life that he possessed in his Lord could never end; the final assize would come, but he would receive the unfading crown of life, if he continued worthy.

Can we speak of the ethics of Paul? I do not know, for ethics strictly understood is a science. Any professor of ethics will assure us that this is the case. A text-book on ethics Paul surely did not write. As specific problems arose he met them, but his answers were the expression of the deep-seated principles governing his life—not the result of a shallow opportunism. They bore the stamp of his set purpose in life: to present all men faultless in Christ Jesus. To achieve this lofty purpose he was obliged to curb and restrain, but the curbing and restraint were not his end; indeed, were to spare them pain. Far from desiring to throw a noose about their necks, he was striving to make possible the larger freedom. And so if Palmer[4] is right when he states that

---

[1] Gal. 1:14.

[2] II Cor. 1:12; 11:23; Phil. 1:14.

[3] II Cor. 2:4; 12:15; I Thes. 2:17; cf. also II Cor. 7:13, 15.

> Ethics is certainly the study of how life may be full and rich, and not, as is often imagined, how it may be restrained and meager,

we are amply justified in speaking of the ethics of Paul.

---

[4] G. H. Palmer, *The Field of Ethics*, p. 213.

INDEX I

NAMES AND SUBJECTS

In this index full-faced type indicates the title or theme of a chapter (*e. g.*, Steadfastness, **197–230**); an asterisk indicates a principal or important reference (*e. g.*, Adultery, 156–158*). The biblical writings (including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha) and the Apostolic Fathers do not appear in this index, but will be found in Index II. In the case of the Greek and Latin writers whose works are cited frequently, only the more important passages are indicated in this index, the complete list of citations being found in Index II. The Jewish writings will be found at the end of Index II. Following Index I is a list of the more important Greek and Hebrew words and phrases discussed in this book.

Abbott, T. K., 136, 229 n.
Abraham, Christians true children of, 15, 88
Abrahams, Israel, 156 n.
Academic Scepticism. *See* Scepticism
Achelis, H., 177
Acta Johannis, 152 n., *Petri*, 152 n.
Adam, contrasted with Christ, 117 f., 120
Adonis, 52
Adultery, 27 f., 88 f., 145, 156–158*, 171, 287
Æschines, 148
Æschylus, 261 n., 272 n.
Æsthetic motif, 95 ff.
Affliction, 227 f. *See also* Suffering
Ages, two, 198 f.*, 299 ff., 305 f., 308
Agesilaus, 48
Agrippa II, 216
Akiba, 149, 175
Alcibiades, 152 n.
Alexander, A. B. D., xvi
Alford, Henry, 86
Amnon, 96
Ananias the High Priest, 221
Ananias and Sapphira, 152
Andronicus, 229
Angels, unmarried, 183; and giving of Mosaic law, 84
Anger, 268–271*
Anrich, Gustav, 47
Anthropos tradition, 122 n.
Anticipation. *See* "Rejoicing in hope"
Antinomianism, dread of, 205 ff., 212 ff. *See also* Freedom
Antiochus Epiphanes, 94
Antisthenes, 186
Antoninus Pius, 138, 148
Anubis, 141
Aphrodite, cult of, 53
Apocalypse of Peter, 146 n.
Apocalypticism, 302 f.
Apostles, married, 182
Apostolic Decrees, 247 n.
Apuleius, 51, 58
Aquila, *transl.*, 257 n.
Aratus, 34
Archippus, 229
Aristarchus, 229
Aristides the Apologist, 159
Aristides the Just, 272
Aristippus the Cyrenaic, 19
Aristodemus, 147

Aristophanes, 49, 215
Aristotle, 37, 77, 118 n., 206, 207, 272. *See also* Index II
Armor of light, 230 n.; of memory, 230 n.
Arnim, J. von, 275 n.
Arnobius, 186
Arnold, E. V., 191
Arnold, Matthew, xi, 64, 266, 295
Arrogance, 75, 187, 250, 254 ff., 261 ff., 303 f. *See also* Presumption, Pride
Artemis, 185
Asceticism, 168 n., 180, 186 f. *See also* Celibacy
Astarte, 186
Athenæus, 146 n., 148, 152
Athenagoras, 159
Athens, Paul in, 34
Atomistic interpretation, 11, 37
Attar, 52
Atticus, 92 n.
Attis, 50
Aubertin, Charles, xvii
Augustine, 137, 140 n., 186
Augustus, 157, 173
Aulus Gellius, 27, 92, 157, 173
Aurelius, Marcus, 137 f., 201, 234. *See also* Index II

Bacchic rites, 54, 166
Baptism, 58, 63, 68 n., 123, 153 f., 155, 244 f.
Bardenhewer, Otto, 43 n.
Barton, G. A., 51 f.
"Bear and forbear" (Epictetus), 27*, 200, 227
Beauty, 97
Becker, W. A., 145 n.
Bergh van Eysinga, G. A., van den, 26 n.
Bernhardy, Gottfried, 145 n.
Bias, 99
Bion, 289 n.
Boasting, 263 ff., 304
Body, views of, 120 ff.* *See also* Dualism, Flesh, Soul, Spirit
Böhlig, H., 100 n.
Boldness, not Arrogance (*q. v.*), 304
Bonhöffer, A., xvii, 93 n., 94 n., 98, 104
Bravery. *See* Courage
Brother, term designating Christian, 240; "for whom Christ died," 239, 262, and often
Bultmann, R., xvi, 41 n.
Burton, E. D., xiii, 71 n., 124 n., 149 n., 198 n., 201, 224 n., 249
Byblos, 52

Cabiri, cult of, 158
Cæcilia Secundina, 230 n.
Calumny, 275
Calvin, John, 274
Capitolinus, 137, 138
Cardinal sins of Judaism, three, 9 n.*, 139, 275
Carneades, 21 n.
Carpenter, J. E., 49
Carter, Elizabeth, 188 n.
Case, S. J., 70 n., 194 n.
Cato, 157, 166, 175 f.; ideal Stoic, 33
Cebes, 148
Celibacy, 116 n., 170, 173, 176–193*; abnormal for Judaism, 8, 180–184; in Isis cult 53; other instances of among Gentiles, 184 ff.; perpetual c. rare, 185 f.; later Christian admiration for, 179. *See also* Asceticism, Marriage
Cephalus, 99
Ceres, 187. *See also* Demeter
Chæremon, 186
Chapman, George, 293
Charity, 285–292*
Charles, R. H., 149 n., 156 n., 173 n., 183 f., 279 n.
Chastisement, 276 f.; indicates God's favor, 222 f. *See also* Suffering
Chloe of Corinth, 287
Chloe, Roman matron, 176
Christ, mystical union with, (*koinonia, q. v.*) 63 f., 65 f.*, 69, 103, 107, 108, 112, 114, 116 ff.*, 125, 129, 133, 145, 154 ff., 169, 181, 195, 196, 226, 232, 236 f., 293 f., 306 f., 309;

Christians make up body of, 74 f., 89, 95, 127 f., 133, 156, 161, 164, 232, 234; contrasted with Adam, 117 f.*; replaced by Lord (*q. v.*) as title, 37. *See also* Jesus, Lord
Christians and world. *See* Separateness, Unbelievers, World
Christius, J. F., 148
Chrysippus, 188 n.
Chrysostom, 86, 222, 268
Cicero, 19, 92 f., 100, 234, 273 f., and often. *See* Index II
Claudius, 210 n.
Cleanthes, 28, 34, 275
Clemen, Carl, 86 n.
Clement of Alexandria, xiv, 52, 77 n., 146 n., 182, 215
Colossæ, errorists in, 126
Colossians, Epistle to, authenticity of, xiv f., 129
Cone, Orello, xvi
Conscience, 41, 98–102*, 105 f.
Conscientia consequens moralis, 101 f.
Constans, 149
Constantius, 149
Contentiousness, 253 f., 272
Contentment, 38, 305 f.
Contest of Homer and Hesiod, 234 f.
Cosmopolitanism. *See* Stoicism
Costobarus, 174
Coulange, Louis, 142 n.
Courage, 219 ff.*
Covetousness, 266, 287 f.
Cowardice, 261
Criteria. *See* Standards
Crœsus, 41
Cumont, Franz, 45, 47, 53 f., 138
Curse (ban), 152 f.
Cybele, priests of, 71 n., 185
Cynics, 19 n., 156; ideal philosopher for Epictetus, 29, 188

Daniel, Book of, 280
Darius, mother of, 41
Deissmann, Adolf, xvii, 152 n., 162, 226, 240 n., 242, 291 n.
Deissner, Kurt, xvii, 95 n.
Demeter, 186. *See also* Ceres
Demons, 140, 142 f., 200
Demosthenes, 93, 156, 260
Diatribe, 13, 41 ff.*, 154; *cf.* 192
Dibelius, Martin, 112 n., 230 n.
Dill, Samuel, xvii
Dio Cassius, 137 f., 210 n.
Dio Chrysostom, 138, 148
Diogenes, 19 n., 48, 156
Diogenes Laertius, 48, 92, 188, 215, 272
Dionysius of Halicarnassus, 147
Dionysus, 54, 166
Divorce, 170–176*; Jesus and, 109 f., 171; frequency of in Roman world, 175 f.
Dobschütz, Ernst von, 138, 149 n., 150 n.
Döllinger, J. J. I., 145 n., 148, 173, 174 n.
Domitian, 148
Drunkenness, 164–169*; no problem for Judaism, 164 ff.; attitude to of Greece and Rome, 166 ff.
Dualism, 120 ff., 180 f., 195; Paul's d. ethical, 122 ff. *See also* Body, Flesh, Soul, Spirit

Edification, 231–294
Eleazar, 212
Eleazar ben Pedat, 175, 256 n.
Eleusinian mysteries, 48, 136
Ellicott, C. J., 274
Elymas, 152
Endurance, 221 ff.*; Stoic emphasis upon, 200, 216 f., 223 f. *See also* Steadfastness
Enslin, M. S., 11 n., 288 n., 297 n.
Envy, 272 f.
Epaminondas, 48
Epaphras, 218, 229
Epaphroditus, 229
Ephesians, Epistle to, authenticity of, xiv f., 129
Ephrem Syrus, 52, 178 n.
Epictetus, 23, 98, 122, 186, 188, 208, 241, 279, and very often; emphasizes Reason, 22, 90 f.; freedom from affections, 22; "bear and forbear"

(*q. v.*); condemnation of immorality, 27 f., 160 f.; forbids revenge, 270. *See also* Index II
Epicureanism, 19, 97, 100, 188 f., 300; Jewish attitude to, 18, 300
Epicurus, 21 n., 31, 119 n., 207, 289
Erman, Adolf, 47 n.
Ernesti, H. F. T. L., xvi
Essenes, 180, 182 f.
Esther, Book of, 280
Eucharist. *See* Lord's supper
Eumolpidæ, 152 n.
Eunuch priests, 185 f.
Euripides, 54, 152 n.
Ewald, P., 98 n.
Example, Old Testament worthies e. for Christians, 87 f. *See also* Imitation
Excommunication, 151–154*
Exposure of children, 188

Faber Stapulensis, 128 n.
Faith, significance of, 64 f.; views of Paul and Epistle of James, 67 f., 309
Farnell, L. R., 53
Faustina, 137 f.
Favorinus, 27
Feasts, heathen. *See* Idolatry
Fehrle, Eugen, 184 f.
Feine, Paul, xvii
Field, F., 257 n.
Firmicus Maternus, 47
Fitting, the things which are, 92 ff., 96
Flagellation, 192
Flesh, contrasted with Spirit (*q. v.*), 65, 120–125*, 180 f. *See also* Body, Dualism, Soul
Fleury, Amédée, xvii, 43 n.
Forbearance, 74, 126, 243–254*
Forberg, F. K., 146 n.
Fornication, 95, 145, 154–156*, 171; Gentile indifference to, 155 f.
Fortification. *See* Endurance, Steadfastness
Fortunatus, 152 n.
Frame, J. E., 112, 128 n., 158, 203 n., 291 n.
Freedom, contrast between views of Paul and Stoics toward, 39 f., 305 f., 310; not license, 75, 85, 126 f., 242 f.; *cf. also* 218. *See also* Antinomianism
Fridrichsen, Anton, 251
Friedländer, Ludwig, 51
Fritzsche, C. F. A., 128 n.
"Fruits of the Spirit," 68, 129, 249
Fronto, 138
Fuller, Thomas, 269

Gardner, Percy, xi f., xv f., 77
Gentiles, immorality of, 94, 135–139*, 144 f., 146, 148, 155 f., 198 f.; "Not as the Gentiles do," 135, 139, 196. *See also* Unbelievers, World
ger, 280
Gerhard, G. A., 42
Gilgamesh Epic, 52
Glossolalia, 244, 250 f.
Gnostics, 124 n.
Golden Rule, 7
Gospels, relation of Paul to. *See* Jesus, Paul's knowledge of
Government. *See* Rome
Great Synagogue, 259
Gretserus, 191 f.

Hadrian, 9 n.
Hall, T. C., 12
Hammurabi, Code of, 52
Happiness, 300. *See also* Pleasure
Harmony, 74, 129, 133, 252 f.
Harnack, Adolf, 118 n., 240 n.
Harrison, Jane, 230 n.
Haustafeln, xiv, 76, 163
Hawkins, J. C., 116 n.
Heaven, Christians' citizenship in, 198 f.
Hecuba, 40
Heinrici, C. F. G., 41 n.
Hercules, 35 n.
Heresy, 253 f.
Hermann, K. F., 145 n., 174 n.
Herodotus, 52, 93, 184

Index I

Hesiod, 272, 276, 291
Hierodouloi, 51–53*
Hilaria, 50
Hillel, 6 f., 175, 258
Hippolytus, 151, 152 n.
Hirsch, E. G., 9
Holtzmann, H. J., xvii
Homer, 261, 276, 292 f.
Homosexual love. *See* Pæderasty
Horace, 25 n., 32, 37
Hospitality, 292 f.*
Humility, 254–261*, 266, 267; Greek view of as vice, 259 ff.; "h. of God," 256 ff.

Idleness, 290 ff.
Idolatry, 139–143*; heathen feasts, 140 ff.*; closely joined to sexual impurity, 143 ff.
Imitation, of God, 7; of Christ, 117 f.*, 120; of Paul, 118 f.; of some notable figure urged by Seneca, 119 n.
Incest, 145, 149–154*, 190 f.
Incontinentia, 27, 160
Ipse dixit ("the master said it"), 215
Irenæus, 48, 211
Isaac, R., 165
Ishtar, 52
Isidorus Pelusiota, 270 n.
Isis, cult of, 50 f., 53 ff., 58, 141, 187; priests of, 213; "chaste days of," 51
Isles of the blest, 48

Jamee, Epistle of, view of faith, 67 f.
Jealousy, 272, f.
Jehoshua ben Levi, 4
Jerome, 138, 176, 179 n., 186, 195, 267 n.
Jesus, 227, 293, and often; aim of, xii, 237 f.; view of Pharisees, 10; and Reconciliation, 4; and Wealth (*q. v.*), 288; not married, 182; Paul's knowledge of, 107–116*, 211, 278 n.; called Lord (*q. v.*). *See also* Christ
Johanan, R., 175, 256 n.
Jones, W. H. S., 98 n.
Josephus, 51, 141, 174, 182 f., 203 n., 212, 213. *See also* Index II
Joshua ben Levi, R., 255
Joy, 296. *See also* "Rejoicing in hope"
Judaism, Ethics soul of Jewish religion, 1, 77; nature of Jewish ethics, 1–10*; body and spirit, 120 f.; humility (*q. v.*) taught by, 255 ff.; justice (*q. v.*) emphasized, 8; law-keeping (*q. v.*), reason for, 2 ff.*, 301; sin, view of, 6; cardinal sins (*q. v.*); marriage, sanity of view toward, 8; separateness of, 6, 237 f., 263; suffering (*q. v.*), views of, 222 f.; representation of in Gospels, 9 f.; relation of Paul to, *see* Paul
Judaizers, recent views about, 70 n.; Paul and, 113
Judas the Gaulonite, 212
Judgment, Final, 65, 197 f., 199, 298 f., 309
Jülicher, Adolf, xvii, 113
Juncker, Alfred, xvi, 85 n., 86 n.
Junias, 229
Justice, 219 f.; Jewish emphasis upon, 8
Justification by faith, xi, 13, 309
Justin Martyr, 23, 56, 159, 173 n.
Juvenal, 149, 176, 187

Kaibel, G., 120
Katochoi, 186 n.
kiddush ha-shem, 5
Kindness, 267; *cf.* 235
Kingdom of God, 198
Knowledge, 250 ff.; *cf.* 245. *See also* Wisdom
Kock, T., 205 n., 207 n., 208 n.
Kohler, Kaufmann, 182
Koinonia, xii, 72 ff., 78, 127 ff., 133, 153, 164, 202–204, 210, 231 ff., 236 ff.*, 250, 252 ff., 271 ff., 277 f., 282 ff.* *See also* Christ, mystical union with
Korah, 152 n.
Kraeling, C. H., 122 n.

Kreyer, J., xvii
Krüger, Gustav, 43 n.

Lactantius, 270
Lagarde, Paul de, 275 n.
Lake, Kirsopp, 178 n., 247 n., 248 n.
Lasterkataloge, 143, 161–164*, 249 f.; *cf.* 193 f.
Law, universal revelation of God, 1 ff., 81 ff.; reveals God, 5, 82; criterion of conduct, 81–89*; division into ceremonial and moral l. not justified, 85; "talismanic" use of, 88; Paul's relation to, 82 ff.*, 86 ff.; freedom from, not license, 85, 242 f.; unwritten l., (*q. v.*); of Christ, 87, 107, 129
Lawsuits, 203, 278 f.
Lecky, W. E. H., xvii, 145 n., 207 n.
Legge, F., 49
Lehmann, Eduard, 251
Leisure, 284 f., 292
Lethe, 230 n.
Lex Julia et Papia Poppæa, 173
Lex Scatinia, 148
Liberty. *See* Freedom
Lietzmann, Hans, 48, 92 n., 94 n., 103, 125 n., 140 n., 142 n., 147, 152 n., 162, 178 n., 250 n.
Lightfoot, John, 149 n., 151
Lightfoot, J. B., 33, 36, 98, 128, 274, 287 f.
Lillie, John, 128 n.
Livy, 234
"Loafers," Thessalonian, 203 f., 254, 277, 290
Long-suffering, 266. *See also* Patience
Lord, title for Jesus replacing "Christ," 57 f.
Lord's supper, 57, 110 f., 141 ff., 168, 290
Love, 74, 126, 129, 232 f., 235 f., 240–243*, 249, 250 ff., 279 ff.; of Christ, 242
Lucian, 49 n., 52, 146, 186, 239 f. *See also* Index II
Lucullus, 268
Luther, Martin, 12, 304 n.
Lying, 233
Lysias, 152 n.

Maccabees, the, 280
Macchioro, Vittorio, 49 n.
Macrobius, 35
Magna Mater, 50, 54
Maimonides, 149, 165
Main, J., 185
Malignity, 273 f.
Marcion, 205 n.
Marcus Aurelius. *See* Aurelius
Mark, John, 215
Marriage, 170 ff., 179–193*; advised by Stoics, 31, 188 f.; minimized by Epicureans, 31, 188 f.; Jewish views of, 8, 182; mixed m., 76, 172 f.*, 204; figure of relationship of Christ and church, 8 f., 192. *See also* Celibacy, Divorce, Incest
Martha, Constant, xvii, 98 n.
Martial, 137, 146, 176, 208 n.
Martin, W., xvi, 180
Matheson, G., 208
Maury, L. F. A., 145 n.
McGiffert, A. C., 214 n.
Meat, consecrated, 141, 244–248*
Meekness, 265. *See also* Mildness
Meineke, Augustus, 99 n., 289 n.
Menander, 98 f., 205 n.
Messiah, the suffering, 226 f.
Meyer, H. A. W., 71 n., 147 n., 239
Mildness, 265 f.*
"Mind of Christ," 108, 117
Missionary note, in early Christianity, 204 f.
Mithraism, 54, 186
Mixed marriages. *See under* Marriage
Moffatt, James, 168 n., 194 n.
Mommsen, Theodor, 150
Monica, 137
Montaigne, Michel de, 20
Montfaucon, Bernard de, 222 n.
Moore, C. H., 47, 55, 186, 201
Moore, G. F., xvii, 9 n., 50, 51 n., 53 n., 54, 65, 82, 85 n., 120 n., 130 n., 139 n., 146, 165, 174, 182, 186, 223 n., 226 n., 255, 256 n.,

275, 280 n., 285 n., 286 n., 292, 301 n.
Morro, W. C., xiii
Moses, 84, 258
Motives (not results), stressed by Stoics, 20, 25 n.
Murray, Gilbert, 230 n.
Musonius, 170 n., 187 f.
Mystery cults, and Ethics, 45–49; unmoral, but not immoral, 46, 49 ff., 64; three characteristics of, 47 f.; initiatory rite essential, 48, 63; goal of, 53 f.; reflect current morality, 55 f.; Paul's attitude toward, 56–59*; similarities with Christianity, 58
"Mystical genitive," 226, 242
Mystical union with Christ. *See* Christ, mystical union with

Nature, conformity to, 19 ff., 200; *sequi naturam*, 19, 91
Nazarites, 182
Nechonyiah ben ha-Kanah, 3 f.
Neighbor, 7, 279 ff.*
nephesh 120 f.
New man, contrasted with old man, 73, 122 ff.*, 135. *See also* Adam
Nicodemus, 25
Nobilius, 257 n.
Numa, 185

Obedience, 75 f., 205–216*. *See also* Rome, Paul's attitude to
Œdipean nuptials, 159
Œdipus, 150
Officium, 92 f.
Old man. *See* New man
Old Testament, Scripture for Paul and early Christians, 13, 37, 86 ff. *See also* Law
Onesimus, 72, 209
Oriental mystery cults. *See* Mystery cults
Origen, 215
Orphism, 49, 121, 215; Orphic tablets, 120, 230 n.
Osiris, 47
Ovid, 51, 187

Pæderasty, 138, 145–149*
Palmer, G. H., 310
Paphos, 52
Papyri, Oxyrhynchus, 140
Paränese, 163
Parousia, 111, 177, 204, 291, 302
Parry, R. S. J., 168 n.
Party spirit, 249, 253; *cf.* 244
Pastoral Epistles, authenticity of, xiv; nature of, xiv, 77 n.
Pataicion, 48
Patience, 267 f., 271; *cf.* 221
Paul, information about, in pre-conversion days, 10 f.; conversion, nature of, 11 ff.; rabbinic training of, 11; Jewish heritage of, 1–16; alienation from Judaism, reasons for, 13 f., 85 f., 211 f.; relation to Stoicism, 17–44, 68 f., 91 ff.*, 105 f., 189 f., 225, 262 f., 268 ff., 273, 284 f., 305 f.; acquaintance with Stoic authors, 34; relation to Oriental mystery cults, 45–59; ethical note central xii f., 63–78, 133, 155 f.; moral soundness of, 70 ff., 130, 308
"Paul and Seneca, Letters of," so-called, 43 n.*
Paulina, 141
Pax Romana, 211
Peabody, F. G., 37 n.
Peace, 252 ff. *See also* Harmony
Perfectionism, 151, 244 f. *See also* *Pneumatikoi*
Periander, 99
Peripatetics, 21 n.
Persius, 137
Peter, 152 n.
Phædra, 150
Philemon, of Colossæ, 208 f., 215, 287, 293; Epistle to, 206
Philemon (Comicus), 206 f., 208 n.
Philo, 5, 25, 94 n., 120, 136, 142 n., 150, 165 f., 215, 219, 228 n. *See* Index II

Philostratus, 48
Phineas ben Jair, R., 255
Phœbe, 285, 293
Phocylidis, 146 n.
Phrynicus, 166 n.
Picator, Fabius, 166
Pindar, 261 n.
Pithocles, 289
Pity, 29
Plato, 54, 97, 99, 121, 122, 146 n., 148, 166 f., 188 n., 207, 251, 260, 272, 277, 306 n. *See* Index II
Pleasure, 18 ff., 306 n. *See also* Happiness
Pliny, 166, 212
Plotinus, 120, 125
Plutarch, 26 n., 122, 148, 176, 260, 268, 272. *See also* Index II
Pneumatikoi, at Corinth, 68, 108 125 ff., 155 f., 159, 205, 243, 244 ff., 250, 262 f.
Presumption, 261 f.
Pride, 75, 263 f. *See also* Arrogance
Priscilla and Aquila, 285
Propertius, 51
Prophylactic motive, 76, 96, 158–160*, 210, 240
Propriety, 95
Prostitutes. *See Hierodouloi*
Pythagoras, 26 n.
Pythagoreans, 121, 215, 268 f.

Quinta, 257 n.
Quintilian, 215

Rabbinic exegesis. *See* Atomistic interpretation
Rackham, H., 93
Ramsay, W. M., 212 f.
Reason, stressed by Stoics, 21, 90 f.; standard (*q. v.*) for conduct, 90 f., 105; equivalent to unwritten law (*q. v.*), 104
Rechabites, 164, 182
Reitzenstein, R., 181, 186 n., 252
"Rejoicing in hope," 295–307
Repentance, Jewish emphasis upon, 4, 85
Resch, Alfred, 108, 112 n., 114, 115
Revenge, 268, 276–282*
Reward and punishment, motive freely used, 65 ff., 73, 199 f., 217 f., 227 f., 295–307*
Riddle, D. W., 70 n.
Rohde, Erwin, 48 n., 56 n.
Roman citizenship, of Paul, 10 f.
Rome, Paul's attitude to, 76, 173, 202 f., 210–214*; Jews in, 210, 213
Ropes, J. H., 41 n., 42 n., 70 n., 112 n., 115 n., 199 n., 204, 220 n., 221 n., 272 n.
Rosenbaum, Julius, 146 n., 147 n., 184
ruah, 120 f.
Rufina, 152 n.

Sabatier, Auguste, 16
Saint, as a designation of Christians. *See* ἅγιος; *cf.* also 155, 159 f.
Salome, 174
Salvation, 47 ff., 58, 67, 85; Greek (not Jewish) conception, 4
Sanday, W. M., 64 n., 71, 101
Satan, "god of this age," 198, 299, 306; "to hand over to," 151 f.
Scepticism, 81
Schechter, S., 146 n., 256
Schmidt, L., 98 n., 99
Schmitz, Otto, xvii
Schöttgen, Christian, 146 n.
Selfishness, 249 f.
Sena, seat of Gallic shrine, 185
Seneca, 23, 54, 100, 122, 140 n., 195, 201, 213, 234, and very often; passion to be overcome, 21; rules for life, 21 f.; picture of Wiseman (*q. v.*), 26; pity, view of, 29; Reason (*q. v.*) as guide of life, 91; Conscience (*q. v.*), 100; advises choice of model, 119 n.; opposition to immorality, 160; regarding wine, 169; and slavery, 207 f.; unsparing denunciation of anger, 270 f. *See also* Index II
Separateness, of Christians, 66 f., 134–196, 197, 237 ff., 306 f., 309
Septuagint, 94, 95, 101, 149 n., 257 n.

Serapis, 140

Service, 75, 127, 129, 282 ff., 309; *cf.* 231–234 *passim. See also* Edification, Love

Sextus Empiricus, 26 n., 81, 148

Sexual impurity, Paul's constant attack upon, 134–196*, 144 f., 154 ff., 159 ff., 190 ff., 194 ff., 201 f., 228 f.; Stoic's opposition to, 27 f., 160 f., 167 ff.; closely joined to idolatry, 143 ff. *See also* Adultery, Fornication, Incest, Pæderasty, Separateness

Sexual intercourse, defilement through, 171, 183 ff.; abstention from, 170 f.

Shammai, 175

Sickness and death, as result of sin, 152 f. *See also* Curse

Sieffert, Friedr., 86 n.

Simon Magus, 152 n.

Simple life, 289

Sin, Jewish view of, 6; Stoic view of, 24 ff.

Slander, 274 f.

Slavery, 206–210*; Jewish attitude to, 7 f., 208; Stoic indifference to, 40 f., 207 f.; various views of in Greek world, 206 f.

Smith, J. M. P., 280

Socrates, 19, 21 n., 90, 104 n.

Soden, Hermann von, xvi

Sohm, Rudolph, 174 n.

Solidarity of mankind, 72 f., 129, 233 f. *See also Koinonia*

Sophocles, 48, 93, 261 n., 284

Sophus, 175

Soul, Greek view of, 121. *See also* Body, Dualism, Flesh, Spirit

Speech, various sins of, 159 f., 274 f.

Spirit, 95, 120 f., 124 ff., 156, 181, 191, 197, 219, 236, 237, 249, 252 f., 297*. *See also* Body, Dualism

Spiritual body, 122

Standards for conduct, Jewish, 81–89; Stoic, 90–106; Paul's, 107–130

Stäudlin, 100 n.

Steadfastness, 197–230, 295

Stealing, 233

Stobæus, 99, 289 n., 306 n.

Stoicism, nature of, 18–34*; Reason emphasized, 21 ff., 90 ff.; Virtue for virtue's sake, 20 ff.; tranquillity (*q. v.*) sought, 21, 30, 40, 235 f., 270; nature of sin, 24 ff.; not conscious of personal God, 24, 200 f.; Wiseman (*q. v.*), 26 f.; need of self-examination, 26; purity of life stressed, 27 f., and often; charged with harshness, 29, 235; will not remit penalty, 30, 276 f., 279 f.; cosmopolitanism, 31 ff., 282 ff.; passions to be subdued, 21; unwritten law (*q. v.*), 103 f.; wealth, 289 f.; pessimistic note in, 201, 295; contrasts with Epicureanism, 20, 31; appraisal of, 33; influence of, 33 f.

Strabo, 52, 184, 185

Strack, H. L., and Billerbeck, P., 146 n., 157, 171 n., 280

Streeter, B. H., 214 n.

Strife, 272

Strong, T. B., 124 n.

Suetonius, 148, 210 n.

Suffering, 198, 199 f., 216 ff., 222–229*, 236; expiatory, *see* Chastisement

Sufferings of Christ, the, 66, 225 ff.*

Suicide, 32

Sulpicius, 175

Sun priestesses, Persian, 185

"Sweet reasonableness," 266 f.*

Symmachus, 257 n.

Sympathy, 267. *See also* Pity

Tacitus, 210 n.

Tamar, 96

Tammuz, 52

Tarsus, 11, 138

Teles, 20 n.

Temperance, 219 f.

Temptation, never more than can be borne, 228. *See also* Suffering

Terence, 31

Tertullian, 43 n., 56 n., 179, 185, 205

Testaments XII Patriarchs, relation of to Paul, 279 n.
Thanksgiving, 303
Thayer, J. H., 158, 221
Theodotion, 257 n.
Therapeutæ, 180, 183
Theseus, 152 n.
Thessalonians, II Epistle to, authenticity of, xv
Theudas, 212
"Things done and things said," the, 47, 63
"Thorn in the flesh," the, 228 f., 263; *cf. also* 191 f.
Thyestian banquets, 159
Tibullus, 187
Titius, Arthur, 114, 116
Torah. See Law
Toussaint, C., xvii, 18, 41 n., 142
Trajan, 148
Tranquility, 22 ff., 217, 295
Trench, R. C., xiii, 260, 274, 287
Trent, Council of, 304 n.
Tribadism, 146
"Tribulation in the flesh," the, 177
Turranius, 292

Unbelievers, Christians' relation to, 76 f., 154, 172 f., 203 ff., 238 f. *See also* Separateness, World
Unwritten law, the, 102–106*

Valentinians, 48
Valerius Maximus, 210 n.
Venereal disease, 147
Vessel, (σκεῦος), apparently signifying wife, 157
Vestal virgins, 185
Vices, lists of. *See Lasterkataloge*
Vincent, M. R., 70 n.
Virgil, 292
"Virgins," 109, 110, 176–179*; "his virgin" (I Cor. 7:36–38), 178 f.
Virtues, lists of, 232; Stoic tetrad of, 219 f., 252; Christian triad of, 252 f.; "virtue for virtue's sake," 20 ff., 301
Vulgarity of speech. *See* Speech

Warfare, life as, 35, 197 f., 218, 229 f.
Watkins, C. H., 124 n.
Weak, the, in Corinth, 245 f.; in Rome, 247 f.
Wealth, 287 ff.*
Weidinger, Kurt, 92 n., 162 f.
Weinel, H., xvii
Weiss, Johannes, xvi, xvii, 84, 87 n., 92 n., 95, 107, 114, 118 n., 126 n., 142 n., 147, 178, 189 n., 205 n., 264 n., 278 n.
Wendland, Paul, 41 n.
Wernle, Paul, 114
Westerburg, Eug., xvii
Westermarck, Edward, 145 n., 149
Wettstein, J. J., 7, 35, 149, 278 n., 291 n.
Whitby, Daniel, 128 n.
Widows, remarriage of, 178 f.
Windisch, Hans, 252 n.
Wisdom, one of Stoic tetrad, 219; of this world, 34, 219. *See also* Knowledge
Wiseman, Stoic concept of, 26 f.
"Works of the law," 67 f.; w. of the flesh, 129
World, Christians and the, 66, 75 f., 96, 135, 197 ff., 202 ff.*, 216, 299 f., 306 f., 309. *See also* Ages, Gentiles, Separateness, Unbelievers

Xenophon, 118, 148, 234 n.

Zahn, Adolf, 85 n.
Zeller, E., xvii
Zeno, 92, 148, 186, 188 n.
Zōckler, Otto, 180

Index I

ἀγαθόν, 97
ἀγάπη, 241 f.*
ἅγιος, 5, 45, 58, 64 n.,* 84, 134
ἄθεοι, 136
αἱρέσεις, 253
αἰσχρολογία, 160
αἰσχρότης, 159
ἀκαθαρσία, 157 f.*
ἀκάθαρτα, 172*
ἀνδρεία, 220 ff.
ἀνέχου καὶ ἀπέχου, 27*
ἄνθρωπος, ὁ καινὸς, 45; ὁ πάλαιος, 123
ἀπάθεια, 22, 38, 217 n., 306 n.
ἀπελούσασθε . . . . ἡγιάσθητε . . . .
  ἐδικαιώθητε, 155*
ἀπερισπάστως, 116 n.*, 188
ἄπιστοι, 202, 203 n.*
ἀποκόψονται, 71*
ἀρέτη, 95
ἀρσενοκοίτης, 147
ἀσωτία, 167*
αὐτάρκεια, 38, 306 n.
βλασφημία, 274 f.
γυναῖκά τινα τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχειν, 149*
διὰ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνάγκην, 188 n.*
δικαιοσύνη, 219 f.
δρώμενα καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα, τὰ, 47
εἰδωλολατρία, 139*
εἴδωλον, 139*
εἶς τὸν ἕνα (I Thes. 5:11), 128 n.*
ἔνθεοι, 136
ἔξω, οἱ, 203 n.*
ἐπιείκεια, 266 f.*
ἐποχή, 81
ἔρις, 272
ἔσω, οἱ, 203 n.*
εὐάρεστος, 95, 97*
εὐδαιμονία, 300
εὐσχημοσύνη, 95
εὐτραπελία, 159 f.
ζῆλος, 271 f.
ζῷον κοινώνικον, 31
ἡγίασται (I Cor. 7:14), 172*
ἡδονή, 300
θλίψις, 227 n.
θυμός, 270 n.
ἴδια, τὰ, 22
καθήκοντα, τὰ μή, 92–95,* 105
κακία, 273 f.*
καλά, 96
καλὸς κἀγαθός, 97*
κατὰ τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἔστιν νόμος, 37*
κατὰ φύσιν, 19 n.
καύχησις, 304
κίναιδος, 147 n.
κοινωνία, 127, 142, 286
κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, 142*
κόσμος, ὁ, 31
κύριος, 45, 57 f.*
λογικός, 24
λόγος ὀρθός, 104
λόγῳ κυρίου, ἐν, 111
μακροθυμία, 267 f.*
μαλακός, 147*
μεγάλη πόλις, ἡ, 31
μέλη, 181*
μεμύημαι, 45
μεριμνᾷν, 116 n.
μὴ γένοιτο, 42
μηκέτι ὑδροπότει, 168 n.*
μὴ πλανᾶσθε, 42
μοιχεία, 156*
μυστήριον, 45 f.*
νόμος ὁ θεῖος, ὁ, 23
ὅπλα, 230 n.*
ὀργή, 270 n.
οὐδεὶς στρατευόμενος ἐμπλέκεται, 188 n.*
παιδαγωγός, 83*
πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν, 126 n.*
παραδοῦναι . . . τῷ Σατανᾷ, 152 n.*
παρὰ φύσιν, 91, 95, 146*
πάρθενοι, 176 ff.*
παρρησία, 304
περιπατεῖν, 7
περισσοτέρως, 308 f.
πλεονεξία, 287 f.*
πλήρωμα, 45
πνεῦμα, 124, 205 n.
πνευματικός, 84, 124
πονηρία, 273 f.*
πορνεία, 149*
πόρνοι, 147 n.
πραΰτης, 265 f.
πρόσθεσις, 81
σαρκικός, 123, 127 n.*

σάρκινος, 123, 127 n.*
σάρξ, 122 f.*; κατὰ σάρκα and ἐν σαρκί, 123 f.*
σκεῦος, 157*
σοφία, 219
συνείδησις, 98 ff.*
σωφροσύνη, 219 f.
ταπεινοφροσύνη, 38, 254 ff.*
τέλειος, 45, 97
τὸ οὕτως εἶναι, 177 n.*
τύποι, 87
ὑπομονή, 221*
φθόνος, 272
φιλαδελφία, 241
φιλόστοργοι, 128*
φρόνησις, 219
φυσικὴν χρῆσιν, τὴν, 91
φῶς, 45
χρηστότης, 267
χριστός, 57 f.*; ἐν Χριστῷ, 63 *et passim*
χρώμενοι τὸν κόσμον ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι, οἱ, 189*
ψυχή, 124 n.
ψυχικοί, πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχοντες, 124 n.*

גילוי עריות, 9 n.*, 149 n.*
החיצונים, 203 n.*
כלי, 157*
עבודה זרה, 9 n.*, 139*
ענוה, 257*
קדש, 5,* 64 n.
שפיכת דמים, 9 n.*

INDEX II

PASSAGES CITED

BIBLICAL REFERENCES, INCLUDING THE APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHA

An asterisk after a page indicates that the passage is there quoted or explained.

Genesis
1:28..............181
19:4–11..........292*
Exodus
5:13...............94
5:19...............94
12:49...............7
16:16, 18..........94*
16:21...............94
36:1...............94*
Leviticus
15:18..............184
18.........9, 139, 145
18:7, 8............149
19:2.........5*, 64 n.
19:9 f.............285
19:15...............8
19:18....7, 129*, 279*
19:18 f............282
19:33 f.........7, 280
20:7................5
20:11.............149*
21:8................5
23:22..............285
Numbers
16:31–35...........152
Deuteronomy
1:17................8
4:35..............139*
8:5.............222 n.
10:18 f.............7*
10:19..............280
10:21...........264 n.
11:22...............7*
13:5...............153
15:11.............285*
16:19...............8
17:7, 12...........153
21:21..............153
21:23...........269 n.
22:21..............153
22:22, 24..........153
22:30..............149
23:1............71 n.*
24:1..............175*
24:15.............269*
24:19–22...........285
25:14...............87
27:20..............149
27:26..............83*
32:35...........280 n.
33:4................82
Joshua
8:9.............269 n.
10:27...........269 n.
Ruth
2...............285 n.
II Samuel
2:10............264 n.
13:12..............96*
22:36...........257 n.
Job
5:17............222 n.
Psalms
1:2.................3*
4:4................268
14:3...............267
15..................8
18:35.............257*
19:7–11.............3
24:1–6..............8
40:8................3
45:4...............257
51:5..............184*
94:12...........222 n.
119:20, 45, 72, 97...3*
130 (131):2.....255 n.
139:17..............3
Proverbs
3:11 f............222*
15:33..............257
18:12..............257
20:22..............281
22:4...............257
24:23...............8
24:29..............281
29:23...........255 n.
Ecclesiastes
10:20...........101 n.*
Isaiah
1:16 f.............26*
1:16–20.............4
33:15 f.............8*
40:18–20.......139 f.*
44:9–20............139
45:20..............139
46:5–7.............139
57:15.............257*
58:3–10............257
61:1..............255*
Jeremiah
9:23 f..........264 n.

10:1–16..........139
Micah
6:8..............257*
Malachi
2:6..............175*
2:9..............8
IV Ezra
5:8..............178
6:21..............178
Tobit
4:10 f..........285 n.
12:8 f..........285 n.
Wisdom of Solomon
8:7..............219*
8:19 f.........121 n.*
9:15..........122 n.*
13–15............140
14:12............143*
14:27............143
17:11............101*
Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)
3:30............285*
27:30–28:7........281
29:12............285*
42:18.........101 n.*
Syriac Baruch
21:13............303*
72:1–74:4......303 n.
I Maccabees
2:64...........218 n.
12:11..............94
II Maccabees
6:4..............94*
6:21..............94
III Maccabees
4:16..............94
Enoch
15:4–7..........183*
83:2............183*
85:3............183*
99:5............178
Psalms of Solomon
10:1–3.........222 n.
Testaments XII Patriarchs
Judah
14:1–8.........168
Issachar
7:2–6.........193*
Zebulun
8:5.........279 n.*
Naphtali
8:8.........171 n.*
Gad
6:3–7.........281*
7:1 f.........272 n.
Benjamin
4:3.........278 n.*
Matthew
5:24..............4*
5:39..........278 n.*
5:44........116, 281*
5:48.............118
6:19 ff...........288
10:9 ff...........108*
11:25.............115
12:31..........275 n.
15:19.....194*, 275 n.
19:1–11..........190
19:6.............109
19:12.............178
22:30.............183
23:27.............158
Mark
3:28...........275 n.
4:11...........203 n.
7:15.............112
7:21 f...........194*
7:22...........275 n.
10:9, 11–12......109*
10:17...........4 n.*
10:21 ff.........288*
11:3 ff..........293*
12:17.......115, 211*
12:28–34..........10
13:7–27..........178
14:14 ff.........293*
Luke
6:28.............115
8:14.............300
10:7 f............108
10:21.............115
10:29............280*
10:40–42......116 n.*
15:11–32.........26*
18:11 ff........9, 255
23:24.............30*
John
3:1–15.........25 f.*
15:19..........199 n.
Acts
5:1–11...........152
9:11..............11
15:28 f........247 n.*
16:30..........4 n.*
16:37, 38..........11
17:28.............34*
18:2...........210 n.
19:33.............152
22:25 ff...........11
23:1 ff..........221*
26:19............216*
Romans
1:5..............215
1:7............64 n.
1:8...........303 n.
1:14..............17
1:18 ff..........146*
1:22–26.........144*
1:23.............140
1:24.............158
1:26............146*
1:26 f............91*
1:26 ff..........145*
1:27..........147 n.*
1:28..............92*
1:29..272 n., 273, 287
1:29 ff..........162*
1:30....261 n., 275 n.
2:1...............42
2:1–16...........299
2:3...............42
2:4..............267
2:5...............65
2:14 ff..........104*
2:14–16.........102*
2:22.............157
2:28, 29.........114*
3:1, 4, 6, 9.........42
3:12.............267
3:27.........42, 87*
3:31..............42
4:1, 3.............42

5:3..............225
5:5.....227 n., 297 n.
5:12–19..........117
6:1, 2............42
6:3 ff...........123
6:4...............65
6:6..............123
6:13..........230 n.*
6:14..............83
6:15..............42
6:16 f...........215
6:19.............158
7.................42
7:2..............179
7:4–6.............83
7:7..........42, 83*
7:7 ff............42
7:12..............84
7:13..............42
7:14..............84
7:14 ff.........12 f.*
7:24.............125*
8:2...............39
8:4, 5...........123
8:7..............215
8:9...........297 n.
8:10..............65
8:13..........297 n.
8:14.......102, 297 n.
8:15, 16......297 n.
8:18.............227*
8:18–25.......296 f.*
8:26.............102
8:26–27..........297*
8:28–39.......297 f.*
8:31..............42
8:35.......227 n., 228
9:14, 20..........42
10:2.............272*
10:3.............215
10:4..............83*
10:16............215
11:1..............42
11:6..............67*
11:18............264
11:20............262*
11:20–22......298 f.*
11:22............267
11:28.............35*
11:33.........219 n.*
12:1........64 n.*, 97
12:2......81, 97*, 198
12:3.............220*
12:9.............242
12:10 128*, 241, 242, 255
12:12.........227 n.
12:13............285*
12:14 115, 281 f.*, 292*
12:15.............29
12:16.........253, 264
12:17.........96*, 278
12:18............254*
12:19.........280 n.*
12:21............278*
13:1–7....76*, 210 f.*
13:7.............115
13:8..........232, 242
13:8 ff...........88*
13:8–10........74, 241
13:9..........157, 242
13:10.........241 n.*
13:11 ff.........302
13:12.....230 n.*, 296
13:12 f..........167*
13:13............272*
14:1–23...........75*
14:1–15:13.....247 f.*
14:4 ff..........278
14:10 65, 68, 248*, 298
14:13............278
14:14............112*
14:15.........239, 242
14:17............296*
14:18..........97 n.
14:19 74, 128, 239*, 253
14:20............248*
15:1.....75, 128, 285*
15:2.............128
15:2 ff..........128
15:5.............253
15:13.........297 n.
15:14.........278 n.
15:16, 19.....297 n.
15:25 ff.........286
15:26, 27........286
15:33............253
16:1.............293*
16:2, 4..........285*
16:7.............229
16:17......119 n., 254
16:19............215
16:20............253
16:26............215

I Corinthians

1:4...........303 n.
1:10.........253 n.*
1:11..........272 n.
1:12 ff..........244*
1:18–31..........264
1:21 ff..........219*
1:24..........219 n.
1:28.........290 n.*
1:30..........219 n.
1:31.............264*
2:1 ff...........215
2:4...........297 n.
2:6 f.........219 n.
2:10.......102, 297 n.
2:12.......124, 297 n.
2:13..........297 n.
2:14 124*, 127*, 297 n.
2:16.............117*
3:1.........118, 127*
3:3....123, 127*, 272*
3:6 ff...........265
3:13....68 n.*, 299 n.
3:16.......143, 297 n.
3:16 f.............7
3:19..........115, 219
3:21 ff..........243*
4:1–5............278
4:4..............102*
4:7...............42
4:12..........275 n.
4:13.........275 n.*
4:16.............118*
4:17.............112
4:21..............42
5.............149 ff.*

5:1 . . . . 135, 149*
5:3, 4 . . . . 151*
5:5 152
5:6 151
5:8 273
5:9–10 136
5:9–13 . . . . 76*
5:10 . . . . 112, 287
5:10–13 277
5:11 . . . . 275 n., 287
5:12 . . . 42, 173, 203 n.
5:13 . . . . . . 153*, 203 n.
6:7 f. 279*
6:9 . . . . . 42, 143*, 157*
6:9 f. . 147*, 162*, 299
6:9 ff. 145*
6:10 . . . . 275 n., 287
6:10 ff. 201*
6:11 . . . . 155*
6:12 . . . . 126*
6:12 ff. . . . . 154 ff.*
6:13–17 . . . . 173 n.*
6:15 . . . . 42, 95
6:16 . . . . 143*
6:18 . . . . 156*
6:19 143
6:19 f. 7
7:1, 2 . . . . 191*
7:3 f. 170*
7:5 . . . . 171*
7:9 . . . . 170*
7:10 . . . . 171*
7:10 f. 109*
7:11 . . . . 173 n.
7:12 . . . . 110*
7:14 . . . . 172*
7:15 . . . . 74, 253
7:18 42
7:22 . . . . 208*
7:24 . . . . 177*
7:25 . . . . 110*, 118
7:25–38 . . . . 176 ff.*
7:26 . . . . 177*
7:27 . . . . 42, 177
7:28 . . . . 177*, 191
7:29–33 . . . . 189*
7:32–35 . . . . 116 n.*
7:35 . . . . 188*
7:36–38 . . . . 178 f.*
7:39 172
7:39 f. 179
8 244
8:1 128, 245, 246*, 250*
8:1 ff. 239*
8:2 . . . . 242, 261
8:7 . . . . 91*, 101
8:10 . . . . . . 101, 246 n.*
8:11 . . . . 75, 239
8:12 101, 127, 232*, 246
8:19 . . . . 246*
9:1 . . . . 42*
9:1–27 . . . . 246 f.*
9:1–10:3 . . . . 244*
9:5 . . . . 192*
9:8 . . . . 87*
9:8 ff. 11
9:9, 14 . . . . 107*
9:18 291
9:19 . . . . 40, 283*
9:19 ff. 231*
9:21 87
9:22 . . . . 246 n.*
9:24–27 . . . . 306*
9:25 . . . . 35*
9:27 . . . . 117, 192*
10 . . . . 140, 141 ff.*
10:1–11 . . . . 244*
10:1–13 11
10:6–11 . . . . 87*
10:7, 8 143
10:12 . . . . 218*
10:13 . . . . 66, 228*
10:14 . . . . 139*, 244
10:19 42
10:21 . . . . 57*
10:22 . . . . 246 n.*
10:23, 24 128
10:25 101
10:25 f. 247*
10:27 101
10:27 ff. 203*
10:28 101
10:29 . . . . . 101, 246 n.*
11:1 . . . . 118*
11:2 111
11:2–16 . . . . 87 n.*
11:14 f. 91*
11:19 . . . . 254*
11:21 . . . . 168*
11:23 . . . . 110*
11:30 . . . . 153*
12:3, 4, 7, 9 . . . . 297 n.
12:10 . . . . 261 n.
12:11 . . . . 297 n.
12:13 . . . . 208 f.*
12:20 272
12:21 158
12:22 ff. 92*
12:27 127
13 . . 114*, 242, 251 f.*
13:4 273
13:5 . . . . 279*
14:1 . . . . . . 241 n.*, 242
14:2 . . . . 297 n.
14:3 128
14:12 239
14:17 242
14:18 250
14:20 273
14:23 . . . . 204*
14:26 . 231*, 239*, 294*
14:33 253
14:34 . . . . 87*
14:34 f. . 87 n.*, 215 n.
14:34–40 . . . . . . 108 n.*
14:37 . . . . 108, 118
14:40 . . . . 87 n.*
15:3 . . . . 111*
15:9 11
15:10 . . . . 263*
15:19 . . 199*, 301*, 303
15:22 117
15:28 . . . . 35*
15:32 19
15:33 . . . . 42, 205*
15:36 42
15:44 . . . . 124*, 127
15:45–49 117
15:46 . . . . 124*, 127
15:47 . . . . 120*
15:51–58 198
15:58 . . . . 218*

16:1 ff............286
16:2.............290*
16:13......197*, 218*
II Corinthians
1:4, 8..........227 n.
1:8 f...............32
1:12.....101, 219, 309
1:12 ff..........264*
1:24.......214*, 296*
2:3..............220
2:4........227 n., 309
2:17...........264 n.
3:12.............304*
3:13...............11
4:2..............101
4:4..............198*
4:8 ff..............38
4:9..............222*
4:16–18..........307*
4:17.......225, 227 n.
5:9..............97 n.
5:10....50, 65, 68, 298
5:11..............101
6:2................65
6:4............227 n.
6:6..........242, 267
6:7..............230*
6:8...............275
6:8–10.............35*
6:14–7:1.......204 f.*
7:4........227 n., 304
7:6..............259*
7:7, 11..........272*
7:13..............309
7:15.....215, 220, 309
8:2............227 n.
8:4...............286
9:2..............272*
9:5...............287
9:7..............286*
9:8............306 n.
9:13..............286
10:1........265*, 266
10:3.............124*
10:3 ff..........230*
10:5 f.............215
10:8........128, 239*
10:12, 17.........264
11:2........192, 272*
11:7..............291
11:8 f.............291
11:21 ff............42
11:23.............309
11:29............284*
11:29 f.............42
12:1...............113
12:7–9...........228*
12:8 f.............113
12:15...35*, 285*, 309
12:18...............42
12:19..............128
12:20.......272*, 275
13:3...............112
13:10........128, 239
13:11.......253, 254*
Galatians
1:4...............198
1:10................42
1:11 f.............113
1:12...............113
1:13 f..............11
1:14...........12, 309
1:16................65
1:17...............113
1:23...............13*
2:2................113
2:10.............286*
2:15..............135
2:17................42
2:19................83
2:20....65, 123*, 124*
3:1.................42
3:2............297 n.
3:4..............224*
3:5............297 n.
3:7–22............84*
3:10 ff..............83
3:10–14...........83*
3:16................11
3:19................42
3:19 f.............84*
3:21................42
3:24 f..............83
3:24–28...........40*
3:27................65
3:28..........208 f.*
4:6............297 n.
4:7.................83
4:16.............304*
4:19................65
4:21 ff..............11
5:1..............218*
5:2...........215 n.*
5:5............297 n.
5:5 f..............252
5:12...............71*
5:13.....39, 75, 127*, 220*, 242*, 283*
5:14 74, 129*, 241, 242
5:16, 17........297 n.
5:18......167*, 297 n.
5:19..............158
5:19 ff......123, 145*
5:20.249, 253 f.*, 272*
5:21..............299
5:21 ff..............83
5:22..129*, 241*, 242, 267, 296, 297 n.
5:22 ff............123
5:23...............37*
5:25.......102, 297 n.
5:26.............248*
6:1.......265, 277 n.*
6:2......87, 107, 128, 129*, 283*
6:3...............261
6:7.................42
6:7–10............299
6:9........218*, 307*
6:10..........202 n.*
6:14...........264 n.
Ephesians
1:8............219 n.
1:13...........297 n.
1:16 ff..........296*
1:17 91*, 219 n., 297 n.
1:23..............127
2:1 ff............135*
2:1–10............123
2:2...............124
2:3..........135 n.*
2:7...............267

2:11 f.............136
2:11 ff...........238*
2:14...........238 n.*
2:18...........297 n.
3:1...........215 n.*
3:10...........219 n.
3:12.............304*
3:13...........227 n.
3:16...........297 n.
3:19.............242*
4:1...............96*
4:1 ff.............233
4:2........254 n., 266
4:3.........253, 297 n.
4:5..........74, 239*
4:11–16...........127
4:15..............125
4:16..............239
4:17.............135*
4:19.........158, 287
4:22..............123
4:25.............233*
4:26.............268*
4:28.......233*, 285*
4:31.....270, 273, 274
4:32..............120
5:1...............118
5:3
158, 159*, 195, 287
5:3 f..............95*
5:4...............303
5:4 f............159*
5:5..........143, 287
5:6 ff...........136*
5:7–14...........229*
5:10.............97 n.
5:16..............198
5:20..............303
5:21..............215
5:22........163, 215*
5:22–33...........192
5:22–6:9...........76
5:24, 33.........215*
6:1..............215*
6:5.........215*, 220
6:5–8............299*
6:5–9............209*
6:8...............299
6:10–20.....218, 229*
6:12..............273
6:17, 18........297 n.
6:19..............304
Philippians
1:3..............303*
1:6..............299*
1:14..............309
1:15...........272 n.
1:15–18.........70 f.*
1:16 f...........249*
1:20..............304
1:27.........96*, 218*
1:28........220, 230*
1:29.............225*
2:1........242, 297 n.
2:1–4..........128 f.*
2:1–11.........117 f.*
2:2..........242, 253
2:3.......254 n., 255*
2:4...............128
2:8..............216*
2:8 ff...........255*
2:9 ff............59*
2:12..215*, 220, 299*
2:15.............206*
2:17.............285*
2:24..............112
2:25..............229
3:1............296 n.
3:3............297 n.
3:4 ff..........11, 66
3:4–6.............13*
3:4–12.............1*
3:6...............272
3:7–11.............65
3:10.............227*
3:14...............66
3:17.............118*
3:19........120*, 161*
3:20.............199*
4:1..............218*
4:2...............253
4:4............295 f.*
4:5...............266
4:6...............303
4:7...............253
4:8...............95*
4:9.........119*, 253
4:11...........306 n.
4:11 ff......38*, 305*
4:13.............263*
4:14...........227 n.
4:16...........291 n.
4:18............97 n.
Colossians
1:3............303 n.
1:4...............242
1:4 f.............252
1:8...............242
1:10..............96*
1:12..............303
1:18..............127
1:19...........219 n.
1:23.............218*
1:24.127, 225*, 227 n.
1:28.....219 n.*, 231*
1:28 f............117
2:2...............242
2:3...........219 n.*
2:7...............303
2:15..............304
2:18......254 n., 260*
2:19..............127
2:21.............126*
2:21 f...........181*
2:23 .219, 254 n., 260*
3................114*
3:1–3............125*
3:1–17............123
3:2..............120*
3:3...............135
3:5.....145*, 158, 287
3:8......270, 273, 274
3:9..........123, 233
3:11...........208 f.*
3:12..254 n., 266, 267
3:12–14..........233*
3:13.............120*
3:14........241*, 242
3:15........253*, 303
3:16.......219 n., 278
3:17.............303*
3:18.............215*
3:18 f............192
3:18–4:1...........76

3:20.......97 n., 215*
3:22............215*
3:22–4:1.........209*
3:22–25..........299
3:24.............299
4:1..............209*
4:2..............303
4:5.......198, 203 n., 204*, 219 n.*
4:10........215*, 229
4:12............218*

I Thessalonians

1:2............303 n.
1:3..........242, 252
1:5............297 n.
1:6 .118, 227 n., 297 n.
1:9.............143*
2:2............261 n.
2:3..............158
2:5..............287
2:9..............291
2:12..............96
2:14.............118
2:15............225*
2:16..............13
2:17.............309
2:19, 20.........265*
3:3.......225*, 227 n.
3:7............227 n.
3:8.............218*
3:12........202*, 242
4:1.............119*
4:1 f...........215*
4:2.............112*
4:3 f...........158*
4:3 ff..........157*
4:3–5...........135*
4:5.............135*
4:6.........288*, 299
4:7.........158, 159*
4:8............297 n.
4:9..........241, 242
4:10.............242
4:10–12....203*, 290*
4:11...........290 n.
4:12........96, 203 n.
4:13–18..........198
4:15, 16, 17......111*
5:4–10........168 f.*
5:8....230*, 242, 252
5:9.............299*
5:11.......128*, 239*
5:13........242, 254*
5:15........241*, 278
5:16...........296 n.
5:18.............303
5:19...........297 n.
5:23.............253

II Thessalonians

1:3........242, 303 n.
1:4............227 n.
1:5.............224*
1:8..............215
2:13....297 n., 303 n.
2:15.............218
3:4..............112
3:6.............112*
3:6–15.........290 n.
3:6–16..........277*
3:7..............118
3:8........290 n., 291
3:9..............118
3:10............290*
3:12......112*, 290 n.
3:13............218*
3:14.............215
3:16.........253, 254

I Timothy

1:20..........152 n.*
2:1 f.........214 n.*
2:9............220 n.
2:12............87 n.
2:15...........220 n.
3:1..............163
3:2............293 n.
3:2 f..........168 n.
3:7............203 n.
3:8........168 n., 287
3:11....168 n., 275 n.
5:3 ff...........163
5:10...........293 n.
5:23..........168 n.*
6:1–2.........209 n.*
6:4.....272 n., 275 n.
6:6............306 n.
6:10......287, 289 n.*

II Timothy

1:7............220 n.
2:4............188 n.
3:2..............287
3:3............275 n.
4:14.............152

Titus

1:7........168 n., 287
1:8.....220 n., 293 n.
2:2............220 n.
2:2 f..........168 n.
2:3............275 n.
2:4, 5, 6, 12....220 n.
3:1............214 n.
3:3..............300
3:9............272 n.

Philemon

2................229
8................304
8 ff., 21.........215*
22...............293*
23...............229

Hebrews

3:6............304 n.
4:16...........304 n.
10:19..........304 n.
10:30.........280 n.*
10:35..........304 n.
13:2...........293 n.
13:20..........253 n.

James

3:15.............127
4:1, 3...........300
4:5............272 n.
4:16............304*

I Peter

1:16............64 n.
2:13–17........214 n.
4:9............293 n.

II Peter

2:13.............300

I John

2:28...........304 n.
3:21...........304 n.
4:17...........304 n.

5:14............304 n.
III John
1–14............293 n.
Jude
9...............275 n.
19..........124*, 127
Revelation
14:4............177 n.

GREEK AND LATIN WRITERS

An asterisk after a page indicates that the passage is there translated or commented upon.

Acta Johannis
86..............152 n.
Acta Petri
2...............152 n.
15..............152 n.
32..............152 n.
Æschylus
Agam. 764 ff....261 n.
Eum. 975.....272 n.*
Apoc. Petri
17.............146 n.*
Apuleius
Met. xi.............51
  xi, 5............58*
Aratus
Phænom. 5........34*
Aristides
Apol. 17, 2........159
Aristophanes
Nubes (Schol.) 195.215
Ranes 454 ff......49*
Aristotle
Econ. i, 5.........206*
Eth. Nic. i, 4, 2..300*
  iv, 1, 3.....167 n.*
  iv, 5, 1.........265*
  v, i, 14......267 n.
  v, 10, 8.....266 n.*
Pol. iii, 13, 14.....37*
Rhet. ii, 12....273 n.*
Arnobius
adv. Gent. v, 7....186*
  v, 17............186
Athenæus
Deipn. xii, 11......52
  xiii, 15.........148*
  xiii, 84......146 n.*
Athenagoras
Supplic. 31–36....159
Augustine
de Civ. Dei vi, 10
  140 n.*
  vii, 26..........186
Conf. ix, 9........137*
Aulus Gellius
Noct. Att. i, 13, 1..92*
  ii, 15, 4........173*
  x, 23, 5.........157*
  xvii, 19, 5 f......27*
Aurelius, M.
1, 17.............138*
2, 1.........25, 234 n.
2, 17..............19*
3, 1................93
3, 4................31
3, 16...............93
4, 23......35*, 200 f.*
4, 41.............122*
5, 33...............27
6, 22..............93*
6, 26...............93
6, 30........98, 283 n.
6, 44..............32*
7, 13...........234 n.
7, 22...............25
7, 63...............25
11, 18..............25
Capitolinus
M. Antoninus xix, 1–9
  137*
  xxiii, 7.........137*
  xxvi, 5..........138*
Chrysostom
Epist. vii, 4.......222*
Hom. ii, 2 on Col.
  222*, 268*
Cicero
Acad. ii, 18, 59.81 n.*
  ii, 47, 145.......26*
ad Attic. xvi, 14.92 n.*
de Fin. ii, 12, 36...19*
  iii, 11, 39 f.....273
  iii, 14, 45.......93*
de Legg. i, 6, 18..104*
  ii, 14............53*
de Nat. D. i, 5, 10.215
de Off. i, 3, 8......92*
  i, 28, 100........19*
Tusc. iv, 15, 34...273
Paradox. 5..........39
Cleanthes
In Jov. 4.....28*, 34*
Fgm. 586 (von Arnim)
  275*
I Clement
13:1...........264 n.*
38:2............187 n.
41:3................95
46:2...........172 n.*
61:1–3..........214 n.
II Clement
5:1, 5..........199 n.
Clement of Alexandria
Cohortatio 2.........52
Pæd. iii, 3.....146 n.*
  iii, 11 ff......77 n.*
Strom. ii, 5........215
  iii, 6...........182*

Contest of Homer and Hesiod
p. 320 Göttling..234 f.
Demosthenes (?)
c. Neæra 80........93
122...........156*
Didache
11:3–12:5......291 n.*
Dio Cassius
Hist. Rom. lx, 6, 6
210 n.*
lxxii, 22.......137*
lxxii, 29.......137*
Dio Chrysostom
Orat. vii, p. 269R.148*
xxxiii, pp. 14R ff.
138*
Diogenes Laertius
vi, 39............48*
vii, 11...........272
vii, 25...........92*
vii, 108..........92*
vii, 121.........188*
vii, 131........188n.*
viii, 46..........215
Diognetum, Epist. ad,
5:1–6:10.......199 n.
Dionysius of
Halicarnassus
vii, 2...........147*
Ephrem Syrus
Opera 459C.......52*
Epictetus
Diss.
1, 1, 13...........42
1, 2, 35...........42
1, 4, 11........81 n.*
1, 5, 10...........42
1, 7, 1............93
1, 7, 21...........93
1, 8, 6.........261 n.
1, 8, 15...........42
1, 9, 12–17........32
1, 9, 26.....28*, 161*
1, 9, 32...........42
1, 11, 23..........42
1, 11, 35.........25*
1, 12, 10..........42
1, 12, 16.......273 n.
1, 13, 3 f........208*
1, 16, 15–21......24*
1, 18, 2...........93
1, 18, 4..........25*
1, 18, 9..........30*
1, 18, 19..........30
1, 19, 7...........42
1, 19, 8..........23*
1, 22, 15..........93
1, 23 *passim*.......31
1, 23, 1–10.......189
1, 24, 12 f........23
1, 24, 20..........32
1, 25, 18..........32
1, 25, 30 ff.......23
1, 26, 1..........20*
1, 26, 6...........42
1, 28, 5...........93
1, 28, 10.........271*
1, 28, 19..........42
1, 28, 24..........42
1, 29, 9...........42
2, 1, 36.........261*
2, 4 *passim*........28
2, 4, 1–11........161
2, 4, 8.........188 n.
2, 5, 24–29.....234 n.
2, 5, 26...........31
2, 7, 1............93
2, 7, 15...........93
2, 8, 2............42
2, 8, 10–14.....7, 28*
2, 8, 11 ff........28
2, 8, 23.........262*
2, 8, 26...........42
2, 9, 4...........161
2, 10 (title)......93
2, 10, 4........234 n.
2, 10, 9.......287 n.*
2, 10, 14..........31
2, 10, 17 f......161*
2, 10, 24 ff......279
2, 12, 4...........25
2, 14, 18..........93
2, 16, 28.........23*
2, 16, 42.........23*
2, 17, 1........261 n.
2, 17, 15..........93
2, 17, 22.........90*
2, 17, 31...31*, 92, 93
2, 17, 31–33.....235*
2, 19, 13.......273 n.
2, 19, 17.......273 n.
2, 19, 24.........36*
2, 20, 13..........31
2, 22, 28.........161
2, 23, 7........234 n.
2, 23, 19.......273 n.
2, 23, 23..........42
2, 23, 38........188*
2, 26, 5.......25, 93
3, 1, 27–38.......161
3, 1, 28...........28
3, 1, 42...........42
3, 2, 2............93
3, 2, 4............93
3, 2, 14.........259*
3, 7, 4............42
3, 7, 19 ff......189*
3, 7, 25...........93
3, 7, 26.......31, 188
3, 10, 2..........26*
3, 10, 19 f.......279
3, 14, 8.........261*
3, 16, 1–16.....205 n.
3, 17, 4...........42
3, 20, 1.........266*
3, 21, 5.......31, 188
3, 22..............29
3, 22, 43......93, 94*
3, 22, 61.......273 n.
3, 22, 67–82.....188*
3, 22, 69..........93
3, 22, 84..........39
3, 22, 94..........98
3, 23, 13..........42
3, 23, 16.......261 n.
3, 23, 21.........90*
3, 23, 25..........42
3, 24, 34.........229
3, 24, 50.........100
3, 24, 56........259*
3, 24, 101.........42
3, 24, 113.........42
4, 1, 1...........39*

4, 1, 2 . . . . 259*
4, 4, 16 93
4, 4, 45 . . . . 241 n.*
4, 5, 10 ff 279
4, 5, 17 31
4, 7, 27 42
4, 8, 26 42
4, 9 *passim* 28
4, 9, 1–18 161
4, 11, 1–36 7
4, 11, 24 42
4, 11, 33 42
4, 11, 36 42
4, 12, 16 93
4, 12, 19 . . . . . . 241 n.*
Ench.
1, 1 22
16 . . . . 30*
19 . . . . 273*
30 . . . . 93, 279
33, 6 . . . . 205 n.*
33, 8 . . . . 187*
33, 15 f 160*
51, 3 . . . . 90*
52, 3 . . . . 23*
S 15 (26) . . . . . 267 n.*
31 (7 or 8) 39
34 (11) . . . . . 267 n.*
36 (42) 39
43 (49) . . . . . 267 n.*
Fgm. 97 . . . . 98*
Epicurus
Fgm. 135 (Usener)
289*
210 . . . . 119 n.*
Euripides
Bacchæ 314 . . . . 54*
316 . . . . 54*
Hippolytus 887 . . 152 n.
Firmicus Maternus
de Errore 22 . . . . . . 47*
Γνῶμαι μονόστιχοι
597 . . . . 99*
654 . . . . 99*
Hermas
Mand. 11 . . . . . 291 n.*
Sim. 1, 1, 1–11 . . 199 n.
2, 1–10 . . . . . . 290 n.
8, 8, 1 . . . . 172 n.
9, 11, 1–4 . . . . 177 n.
9, 27 . . . . 293 n.
Herodotus
Hist. i, 97 93
i, 198 . . . . 184*
i, 199 . . . . . 52* (bis)
v, 49 93
vii, 104 93
Hesiod
Op. (*Works and Days*)
11 ff 272*
195 f 272*
311 . . . . 291*
709 ff 276*
Homer
Il. xxiv, 213 276
Od. xiv, 401–406
292 f.*
xvi, 86 261
xvii, 51 and 60 . . 276
Horace
Epp. ii, 2, 213 ff 32
Sat. i, 3, 115–117
25 n.*
Ignatius
ad Ephes. 16:1 149
ad Polyc. 5:2 . . . 187 n.
Irenæus
adv. Hær. i, 6, 2 . . 48*
iv, 30, 3 . . . . 211*
Isidorus Pelusiota
Epist. iv, 223 . . 270 n.*
Jerome
Comm. in Ep. ad Gal.
(5:22) . . . . 267 n.*
Epist. 123, 10 . . . . 176*
adv. Jovin. i, 7 . . 179 n.*
ii, 13 . . . . 186*
Josephus
Antt. 15, 7, 10 . . . . 174*
15, 9, 2 . . . . . . 203 n.
18, 1, 1 . . . . 212*
18, 3, 4
51*, 141*, 213*
18, 3, 5 . . . . . . 210 n.
20, 5, 1 . . . . 212*
Wars 2, 8, 2 . . . 182 f.*
2, 8, 13 . . . . 183*
7, 8, 6 . . . . 212*
c. Apion. ii, 24 184
Justin Martyr
Apol. i, 2, 4 . . . . 23*
i, 26, 7 . . . . 159 n.
i, 54–60 56
i, 62 56
i, 66 56
ii, 3 . . . . 173 n.
ii, 12, 2 . . . . . . 159 n.
Juvenal
Sat. 6, 229 f 176*
6, 522–529 . . . . . 187*
Lactantius
de Ira Dei 17 . . . . 270*
Lucian
Amor. 28 . . . . 146 n.
D. Mer. 5, 1 . . . 146 n.*
de Morte Peregrini 13
240*
de Syr. Dea 6 . . . . . 52*
15 . . . . 186*
27 . . . . 186*
50 ff 186*
Vit. Demon. 11 . . 49 n.*
Lysias
Orat. 6, 51 . . . . . 152 n.
Macrobius
Sat. i, 20, 11 . . . . . . 35*
Martial
Epigr. iii, 94 . . . 208 n.*
vi, 7 176
ix, 16 . . . . 176*
Menander
Fgm. 218 . . . . . . 205 n.*
Musonius
13a . . . 170 n.*, 187 f.*
Origen
c. Cels. i, 7 215
Ovid
Am. i, 8, 74 . . . . . . 187*
iii, 10, 2 . . . . 187*
Ars Amat. i, 75 ff . . 51*
Philemon (Comicus)
Frg. 22 . . . . 208 n.*
95 . . . . 206 f.*

Index II

Philo
de Decal. 15........5*
de Ebriet. 39......25*
Legg. Alleg. i, 12...120
i, 19–23.......219*
de Mut. Nom. 42 94 n.*
de Plant. 41....165 f.*
de Spec. Legg. i (*de Vict.* 8)...142 n.*
i (*de Sacrific.* 8) 228 n.*
iii, 3..........150*
de Vit. Contempl. 5 136*
Quæst. in Genesin i, 99...........215
Philostratus
iv, 18.............48
Phocylides
Carmen 180....146 n.
Pindar
Olymp. 13, 10 f. 261 n.*
Plato
Cratylus p. 400BC.122
Crito 6, p. 46B....90*
Georgias p. 493A..122
Legg. ii, 9, p. 666AB 166 f.*
iv, 7, p. 716A...260
Republic. i, p. 331A 99*
ii, p. 369B...306 n.*
Sympos. 191E..146 n.
Pliny
Hist. Nat. xiv, 14 (13) 166*
Plutarch
Amat. 5, p. 751D 146 n.*
de Amore Fratr. 17, p. 488C......268 f.*
de Comm. Not. 12, p. 1064F.....94 n.*
33, p. 1076 B.26 n.*
de Educ. Puer. 15, p. 11DF.......149*
de Sera Num. Vind. 3, p. 549D.....260*
5, p. 550DE....118
de Stoic. Repugn. 9, p. 1035C....104 n.*
Quomodo adul. poet. aud. debeat 4, p. 21F..........48*
Vit. Aristides 7...272*
Cato Min. 7...176*
25..........176*
52..........176*
Lucull. 32.....268*
Polycarp
ad Philipp. 5:3....149
Propertius
Eleg. ii, 19, 10.....51*
ii, 33..........51*
iv, 5, 34........51*
"Pythagoras"
Golden Verses 40–44 26*
Quintilian
Inst. Orat. xi, 1, 27.215
Seneca
de Benefic.
3, 16, 2.........176*
4, 26, 1.........279*
4, 28, 3..........279
5, 17, 3.....30*, 262*
7, 26, 4..........161*
7, 31, 1.......278 n.*
de Brev. Vit.
3, 5.............284*
7, 1.............160*
7, 5.............284*
14, 2.............21*
17, 4............305*
18, 1 ff.........292 n.
20, 3............292*
de Clem.
1, 4, 2..........213*
1, 17, 1–3.......277*
1, 18, 3.........208*
1, 23, 2.........277*
1, 24, 1.........277*
2, 5, 1–4.........29*
2, 5, 3..........235*
2, 5, 5..........271*
2, 6, 2......29*, 236*
2, 6, 3..........236*
2, 7, 1...........30*
de Const. Sap.
12, 3......276*, 277*
13, 1............262*
19, 3.........218 n.*
de Ira
1, 2, 1..........270*
1, 6, 4..........276*
1, 7, 2...........21*
2, 8 and 9.......137*
2, 9, 4..........137*
2, 10, 6.........270*
2, 12, 2.........270*
2, 27, 2.........298*
2, 31, 7.........234*
2, 34, 1.........279*
2, 34, 5.........279*
2, 36, 5.......270 n.*
2, 36, 6.........270*
3, 8, 1 ff.......205 n.
3, 15, 3 f........32 n.
3, 15, 4..........32*
3, 25, 3.........271*
3, 36, 1 f........26 n.
3, 37, 4.........305*
3, 43, 1 f.......271*
ad Marc.
6, 3.............20 n.
de Otio
1 (28), 4....279, 292*
3 (30), 5..234, 283 n.*
4 (31), 1.........31*
5 (31), 1....19*, 292*
de Prov.
1, 5 f...........223*
3, 3.............223*
4, 3.............223*
4, 12............217*
4, 16............217*
5, 4..............35*
5, 8.............263*
6, 7 ff...........32 n.
de Tran.
7, 4.......26*, 205 n.
11, 8–12...........41

de Vit. Beat.
4, 2..............24*
6, 2..............91*
7, 3..............21*
9, 2..............20*
17, 3 f...........27*
20, 3............289*
20, 3–5.........21 f.*
20, 4............100*
21, 2............289*
22, 1..........289 f.*
23, 1............289*
24, 3.........40*, 41
Ep. Mor.
7, 4............31 n.
11, 8–10.........119*
21, 7............289*
25, 5–6.........119 n.
41, 2............100*
47, 11...........207*
47, 12............41*
65, 20 f.........121*
70, 14............32*
74, 18...........189*
78, 16............35*
83 *passim*.......169*
83, 17–21.........168
85, 33.........20 n.*
85, 10..............21
85, 40..........22 n.
88, 30...........235*
95, 52...........234*
95, 53............31*
96, 5............229*
104, 3.29, 32 n., 283 n.
107, 9...........295*
Herc. Fur. 426....32*
Thyestes 607–612 .207*
Sextus Empiricus
ix, 133.........26 n.*
xi, 140...........81*
xi, 190..........148*
Sophocles
Antig. 439 f......284*
Œd. Tyr. 75.......93
872 f.......261 n.*
Fgm. 753.........48*
Stobæus
Florileg. v. 43.306 n.*
x *passim*.....289 n.
x, 38.......289 n.*
xxiv, 11.........99*
xxiv, 12.........99*
Strabo
Geogr. xiv, 1, 23.185*
xvi, 1, 20...52, 184*
Suetonius
Claud. 25.....210 n.*
Dom. 8..........148*
Tib. 36........210 n.
Tacitus
Annal. ii, 85....210 n.
Teles
Περὶ ἀπαθείας (Hense, p. 62)....... 20 n.*
Terence
Heaut. i, 1, 54.....31*
Tertullian
de Anima 20.....43 n.
de Exh. Cast. 13..185*
adv. Marcion. v, 12 205 n.*
de Monog. 3...179 n.*
17...........185 n.
de Præscript. Hær. 40 56 n.*
ad Uxor. i, 3...179 n.*
i, 6...........185 n.
Tibullus
Eleg. i, 3, 26......187
Valerius Max.
i, 3, 2..........210 n.
Virgil
Æn. ix, 612......292*
Xenophon
Mem. i, 6, 3......118
ii, 3, 18......234 n.

RABBINIC WRITINGS

The tractates of the Mishnah and Talmud are arranged in alphabetic order. M prefixed indicates Mishnah; Jer, Jerusalem (*i. e.*, Palestinian) Talmud. The unqualified tractates (with the exception of Abot) are to the Babylonian Talmud. An asterisk after a page indicates that the passage is there quoted or commented upon.

ʻAbodah Zarah 3b.258
20b...........255*
Abot 1, 14.........6*
3, 6..............4*
6, 6..............4*
Arakin 16b......233*
Berakot 7a.......258
ʻErubin 13b.....255*
M. Ketubot 5, 6 171 n.*
Ketubot 11b.....143*
Kiddushin 29b...182*
Megillah 31a....256*
Jer. Nedarim 41b.165*
Rosh ha-Shanah 17b 258
M. Sanhedrin 7, 4 149*
Shabbat 31a 7*, 8*, 182*
Taʻanit 11a......165*
22b..............165
Yebamot 62a....182*
63a...........182*

63b 182*

Mekilta
  Yitro 8 182
Sifrè Deut. 48 .... 301*
  345 82
Genesis R. 8, 13 .. 258*
Exodus R. 28, 5 .. 258*
  28, 6 .... 82*
Leviticus R. 34, 3 .. 7*
Pesikta Rabbati 36
  226 n.*
Tanhuma, ed. Lublin
  Noah 19 .... 4*
Tanhuma, ed. Buber,
  2, 13a 258*

Maimonides
Yebamot 982 149

DATE DUE

~~MAY 21 '76~~			
~~MAY 20 1977~~			
~~[illegible] 1979~~			
~~FEB 29 '80~~			
~~APR 30 '80~~			
~~JAN 31 '8[illegible]~~			
~~JUN 15 1982~~			
~~JUN 15 1982~~			
~~[illegible]~~			
~~JUN 15 1983~~			
~~JUN 15 1984~~			
~~JUN 15 1986~~			
~~DEC 31 [illegible]~~			
~~JUN 15 1988~~			
JUL 7 1994			
AUG 03 1994			

GAYLORD PRINTED IN U.S.A.

BS2655 .E8E5
The ethics of Paul,
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00155 7802